

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 01968624 5



**ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE**  
TORONTO, CANADA

LIBRARY

PRESENTED BY

Rt. Rev. William A. Egan







A SHORT HISTORY  
OF THE  
CATHOLIC CHURCH.

BY  
F. GOULBURN WALPOLE.

---

LONDON:  
BURNS & OATES, LIMITED.  
NEW YORK, CINCINNATI, CHICAGO: BENZIGER BROS.



MAY 15 1953

LONDON : BURNS AND OATES, LIMITED.

*This history has been compiled from notes made by the author for his own instruction. It makes no claim to scholarship; indeed, the author only offers it to the public in the hope that it may be useful to those who may not have leisure or inclination to read standard works which are necessarily voluminous. The work may be properly described as a skeleton history of the Church, and may be useful as a book of reference. The author has copied largely from the "Manual of the Universal Church" by Dr. Alzog, Professor of the University of Freiburg; from Bishop Hefele's "History of the Christian Councils," from the late Cardinal Manning's "Story of the Vatican Council," from the Rev. Joseph Reeve's "General History of the Christian Church to the end of the Eighteenth Century," from Mr. W. S. Lilly's writings, and from other orthodox Catholic writers.*





**Dedicated**

TO

THE REVEREND FR. PETER GALLWEY, S.J.,

A VALUED FRIEND

AND VENERATED ECCLESIASTIC.



# CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION.	
Science and Theology ... ..	xi
CHAPTER I.	
Infallibility and Indivisibility of the Church ... ..	I
CHAPTER II.	
Foundation of the Church.—First Synod presided over by St. Peter.—Description of the different kinds of Councils or Synods.—Churches founded by the Apostles.—The Hierarchy instituted ... ..	7
CHAPTER III.	
Progress of Christianity.—Establishment of Churches in the East and in Europe.—Synods held in the Second, Third, and Fourth Centuries.—Rise of Arianism ... ..	18
CHAPTER IV.	
First Ecumenical Council held at Nicœa.—Arius and his followers condemned for maintaining that the Son was not consubstantial with the Father.—The Nicene Creed promulgated ... ..	31
CHAPTER V.	
Second Ecumenical Council held at Constantinople.—Addition to Nicene Creed in consequence of heretical interpretation of that Creed by the Arians.—Pelagian and Leporian heresies condemned at Synods held at Carthage ... ..	45

	PAGE
CHAPTER VI.	
Third Ecumenical Council held at Ephesus.—Heresy of Nestorius, asserting two personalities in Jesus Christ, condemned ... ..	58
CHAPTER VII.	
Fourth Ecumenical Council held at Chalcedon.—Monophysite heresy of Eutyches, confounding the two natures of Jesus Christ, condemned ... ..	76
CHAPTER VIII.	
Persecution of the Christians during the first four centuries ... ..	87
CHAPTER IX.	
Decline of the Roman Empire.—Progress of Christianity in Great Britain and France.—Conquests of Mohammed.—Decline of Christianity in the Oriental Provinces of the Empire.—Extension of the Monastic Institution to the West ... ..	100
CHAPTER X.	
The Monastic Orders.—The Middle Ages.—The Great Schism, Papal Supremacy claimed by two competitors.—The Jesuits.—Council of Florence.—Further addition to the Nicene Creed ... ..	114
CHAPTER XI.	
Indulgences.—The Lutheran Reformation.—Establishment of the Tribunal of the Inquisition.—Persecution of the Catholics ... ..	135
CHAPTER XII.	
The Council of Trent ... ..	146
CHAPTER XIII.	
Massacre of St. Bartholomew.—Condemnation of the Jansenists.—The French Revolution of 1789.—The Vatican Council.—Rome incorporated in the kingdom of Italy ... ..	185



# INDEX.

	PAGE		PAGE
Agrippinus, Bishop ...	18	Florence ...	50, 132
Alexander, Bishop, 27, 28, 30,	35, 40	Hippo ...	54
Apiarius ...	57	Milan ...	53
Apollinaris, Bishop ...	59	Nicœa ...	31
Aristotle ...	7	Rome ...	53, 55, 63, 191
Arius ...	4, 27, 35, 42, 43	Sardica ...	46
Avignon, Papal Court		Trent ...	146
transferred to ...	121	Trullo ...	85
Baptism ...	17, 21, 162	Vatican ...	191
Bede, Venerable ...	20, 109	Cyril, Bishop ...	63, 66, 73
Calvin ...	142	Dioscorus, Patriarch...	78
Celibacy ...	85	Donatists ...	23, 24
Charlemagne ...	109	Druids ...	20
Churches founded three		Easter, date for observ-	
first centuries, 16, 18, 19, 20		ance of ...	42
Clement, Pope ...	16	Eusebius of Cæsarea, 34, 36,	
Clovis ...	104	40, 42	
Confession and Abso-		Eusebius of Nicomedia, 28,	
lution ...	17, 171	36, 40	
Constantine the Great, 24, 31		Eutyches, Abbot ...	77
38, 44, 96		Flavian, Patriarch ...	77, 80
Councils or Synods :		Gentiles ...	12, 13
Alexandria ...	23, 55	Gnostics ...	18
Antioch ...	22	Greek Schism ...	121
Arles... ...	13, 24	Hosius, Bishop, 23, 34, 39, 40	
Carthage ...	21, 52, 56, 57	Huguenots ...	186
Chalcedon ...	76, 78	Iconoclasts ...	108
Constance ...	132	Indulgences ...	135
Constantinople 45, 55, 109		Infallibility of the Pope	
Elvira ...	23	decreed ...	197
Ephesus ...	59, 6 5.	Inquisition ...	141
		Jansenists ...	188

	PAGE		PAGE
Jesuits ... ..	117, 124	St. Bruno ... ..	115
John, Patriarch of Antioch... ..	...68, 72	St. Chrysostom ... ..	55
Jovinian Heresy ... ..	53	St. Cyprian ... ..	21, 59
Leporian Heresy ... ..	57	St. Dominic ... ..	116
Luther ... ..	137, 147	St. Francis of Assisium ... ..	116
Meletian Schism ... ..	42	St. Gregory of Nazian- zus ... ..	47
Memnon, Bishop ... ..	69, 73	St. Ignatius Loyola ... ..	117
Middle Ages ... ..	115	St. John ... ..	17
Mohammed ... ..	106	St. Mark ... ..	18
Monastic Orders, II, III, ... ..	115	St. Paul 1, 8, 12, 16, 17, 19	
Monotheism ... ..	85	St. Peter, I, II, 12, 16, 17, 19	
Montanism ... ..	14, 21	St. Philip Neri ... ..	117
Nestorius ... ..	59	St. Simon Stock ... ..	117
Nicene Creed ... ..	41, 48, 133	St. Vincent de Paul ... ..	118
Origen ... ..	59	Scriptures, Canonical .	149
Papacy, Temporal Power founded ... ..	105	Socrates ... ..	7
Papal Supremacy claimed by two com- petitors ... ..	121	Spirydion, Bishop ... ..	36
Paphnutius, Bishop ... ..	36	Tertullian ... ..	18, 19, 20, 59
Paul of Samosata ... ..	22	Theodosius, Emperor 47, 79	
Pelagian Heresy ... ..	55	Trent, Decrees of the Council on :	
Pepin, King of France ... ..	104	Baptism ... ..	162
Persecutions under the Empire ... ..	87	Canonical Scriptures ... ..	149
Persecutions by Pro- testant Countries 99, 142		Communion in both species ... ..	176
Photius ... ..	108	Confirmation ... ..	165
Plato ... ..	7	Eucharist, the 166, 167	
Potamon, Bishop ... ..	36	Extreme Unction ... ..	175
Reformation, Lutheran 137, 147		Justification... ..	152
Rome incorporated in the kingdom of Italy 197		Matrimony ... ..	181
St. Alban ... ..	20	Ordination ... ..	179
St. Athanasius, 34, 40, 43, 44		Original Sin ... ..	151
St. Bartholomew, Mas- sacre of ... ..	186	Penance ... ..	170
St. Benedict ... ..	112	Sacraments in gene- ral ... ..	159
St. Bernard ... ..	116	Sacred Books, use of ... ..	150
		Sacrifice of the Mass ... ..	177
		Transubstantiation .	167
		Unitarians ... ..	4
		Wickliff, John ... ..	130

## INTRODUCTION.

---

AT the present time, when the minds of men are distraught with speculative theories, and theologians and scientists are doing battle with one another, unquiet minds would hail with delight the man who could point out a harbour of rest and safety.

As the matter at present stands the theologian has better claims to be heard in controversy than the scientist ; for the enlightened theologian accepts the facts presented by the scientist, and refuses only to accept his conclusions when the data upon which they are founded appears to be insufficient. The scientist cannot accept any of the conclusions of the theologian because he regards as worthless the premisses upon which they are based ; in fact, the scientist is, from his point of view, debarred from entering upon controversy so far as theology is concerned ; he can only dispute with scientists upon the basis of science. The theologian, on the contrary, can claim to be heard on metaphysical, if

not on scientific grounds ; and so long as the scientist admits that he is powerless to throw any light upon the "first cause," the theologian is free to adduce metaphysical reasons in proof of the existence of God — and the scientist is hardly justified in treating his arguments with scorn.

Metaphysics, it is true, are not facts, and with facts only will the scientist, in theory, occupy himself ; but while all scientists will agree in this, and by some it is strictly practised, others have drawn unproved conclusions from their observation of facts, and, among other conclusions, that all religions are false and worthless. In so doing the scientist is unscientific, and cannot but acknowledge that he is so. In proof of this, Atheism has generally been abandoned, for to assert that there is no God is to assert what cannot be proved ; and scientists, therefore, who are without religion are no longer Atheists but Agnostics—they know nothing—and thus save themselves from asserting what cannot be proved, viz., the non-existence of God.

Some scientists, nevertheless, show their disdain for persons who assert that God exists ; why they should do so it is difficult to surmise, unless it be that they hold that outside the region of scientific deduction all is foolishness, and that they have a mission to set the world right.



Scientists are honoured, and rightly so, so long as they confine themselves to the exploration of natural history ; and by their labours in practical science, such as chemistry, sanitation, and electricity, they have conferred great benefits upon mankind. But with speculative science, such as the theory of evolution, the masses are not concerned ; people look for results, and each one for their application in his own individual case. To the millions of toilers who live on this planet, it would make no difference if all the speculative scientists were swept off the face of the earth ; they hold in higher esteem the man who secures them sixpence a day more wages, or even an additional half-pint of beer.

The Atheist had better reason to be listened to than his modern prototype, the Agnostic, because he was dogmatic, and if his dogma were accepted it would tend in a very sensible degree to affect the lives of many, maybe of all ; whereas the Agnostic offers to the world his researches in physical and psychological evolution only, and even when the exactness of his facts is admitted, the result is *nil*. Each succeeding generation of scientists may have dived deeper into what is called the law of nature, and adduced fresh evidence of the theory of evolution ; and although the high culture and intellectual dis-

cernment of the scientists be very justly appreciated by that section of mankind who are deeply interested in the subject, and who have the capacity to follow and understand synthetical reasoning, yet in the absence of any results their discoveries are for the multitude worthless : there is no increase of wages and no extra half-pint of beer.

As regards theology it is different ; the human mind, even in the masses, is by nature inductive and instinctively metaphysical, and consequently, if for no other reason, religious : the fact of the world's creation suggests a creator, and the dependence of created beings upon their creator, with the result that religion influences, in a very sensible degree, the lives of mankind.

The conflict of opinions, however, is not limited, as between theologians and scientists. Putting the latter aside, there remains the conflict of religious creeds based on Christianity. It is not proposed to offer any observations as to their respective claims to consideration, except that in writing a history of the Catholic Church it will be necessary to set forth the theological views which have, from time to time, been pronounced by the Church to be heretical. To consider these teachings from a controversial point of view would be useless ; unlike the Catholic Church, which in the greater part of the universe is a subject of great interest, the

teaching of the Christian sects is only locally interesting. The religious views promulgated at various periods have been in a great measure the outcome of political interests at stake at the time, and are generally of very subsidiary importance in the history of religion. Moreover, the various sects are so numerous, and their religious views so conflicting, that practically the conflict is not one of authoritative teaching, but of opinions. Forgetful that the living voice of the Church is older than the Scriptures, and that the dead letter has need of the living voice for its explanation, good and learned men promulgate one set of dogmas, and equally good and learned men promulgate many other sets of dogmas ; and they must, therefore, if honest, admit that their teaching may be erroneous. Hence, there is practically a war of opinions only.

The only interest for the student which the Christian sects present is the effect which they have upon faith generally. Historically, they point to one result very distinctly ; Protestantism has been in its essence a process of elimination. It has taught nothing but what had already been taught by the Church ; but, on the other hand, has been concerned only with how much of Catholic teaching it shall reject.

Hence, what might have been foreseen has

occurred; the process has by natural declension reached to the elimination of the Divinity of Christ by the Unitarians. It has been a ladder by which to descend to Agnosticism.

These remarks have been introduced in order to show that from the point of view of the Catholic Church neither speculative science nor sectarian Christianity contains any sure basis of faith or morals. In the first chapter it is proposed to state the claims of the Catholic Church to speak as the living voice of Christ's Church.



# *History of the Catholic Church.*

---

## CHAPTER I.

THE Catholic Church claims to be infallible in the persons of the successors of St. Peter, that is to say the Popes. The Church claims that the Popes are divinely directed in their teaching, and consequently infallible in matters of faith and morals. That the infallibility of the Church was instituted by Christ Himself. "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church ; and the gates of hell shall never prevail against it": or, according to St. Paul, in his Epistle to Timothy, "He made the Church of the living God the pillar and the ground of truth."

The Church also claims that it is indivisible. "Is Christ divided?" (St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians.)

"Credo in unam sanctam Catholicam et Apostolicam Ecclesiam" is the answer to the question whether Jesus Christ founded several Churches or only one Church. These words are pronounced

publicly and solemnly by all Christians — by Russians, Greeks, Syrians, as well as by Catholics. All believe in one Church, and unity is, for all Christians of the East as well as of the West, the first mark of the true Church of Christ. There is one Church only of Jesus Christ—all are agreed on that point. It remains to be determined which is that Church.

From the Apostolic times till the ninth century it was not necessary to ask that question. *Ubi Petrus ibi Ecclesia* practically contained the whole tradition of the East and West.

Many quotations from the New Testament other than those above referred to have been adduced by Catholic theologians in support of the claim of the Church to infallibility ; but putting aside Scriptural testimony, which may be and has been interpreted in different senses by various persons, the Church claims that Christ being Divine, His teaching must have partaken of His nature, and must consequently be free from all the error incidental to that of mere man. Since Divine teaching cannot be mutable, it must endure until the end ; and if what is false could creep into His Church, Christ could no longer be held to be Divine, for the religion He taught would have been a merely human religion, and the true faith would have passed away in the manner of all human laws

and institutions. Hence the Church claims that, the Divinity of Christ being admitted, an infallible interpreter of His teaching must exist and be apparent.

The Church venerates and holds up to veneration the Scriptures ; but it holds that the Scriptures are insufficient by themselves, as a means by which Christian doctrine can be defined. The veneration in which the Scriptures have been held by the Church is best exemplified by the zeal and industry of the Monks in the early ages, who devoted their lives to transcribing them ; but the Church alleges—even admitting that every transcription were identical and free from error—that the insufficiency is manifest, for the simple reason that until printing was invented, few persons could read, and that the people were dependent—as they still are—for direction, both for doctrine and moral conduct, upon their teachers, who when not guided by the authority of the Church have interpreted and do now interpret the Scriptures differently. Nevertheless, it is still contended that the doctrine and ethics of Christianity can be gathered from the Gospels ; it is, however, impossible to believe that any one left to himself, that is without guidance, would by reading the Gospels—or, if he cannot read, hearing them read—be able to assert the doctrine of the Trinity.

Arius, in the fourth century, contended that it was impossible to reconcile two apparently contradictory dogmas of the equality of the Logos with the Father, and of His distinction from Him. The Unitarians of the nineteenth century, with the Gospels in their hands and arguing from its text, claim to be Christians, and yet deny the Divinity of Christ.

With regard to morals, in the abstract greater unanimity is found ; there remains, however, much difference of opinion. For instance, marriage is a Sacrament in the Catholic Church, and indissoluble ; whereas in Protestant countries marriage is a legal contract, and social and moral status is determined in accordance with law : as a result, we find that in some Christian countries a man or woman who has committed no offence against morals may be divorced and marry again, and be acknowledged by the law and received in society as chaste persons, whereas from the Catholic and Anglican point of view such persons would be held to be living in adultery.

There are two broad schools of morals—one school is based upon the science of deontology, and holds that τὸ δέον—what men ought to do—is the fundamental notion of morality ; the other school supports the system of making morality dependent on the production of happiness, and which

has long been designated in Germany by the term Eudemonism, derived from the Greek word for happiness (*εὐδαιμονία*).

The latter school hold that the conception of moral obligation can be resolved into some operation of the intellectual faculties, as the perception of general utility. The former school hold that, although it may be true that all acts of duty are, taken in all their consequences, useful ; right, duty, what we ought to do, cannot be arrived at from consideration of consequences. The Catholic Church is in agreement with this school ; it claims that in morals, as in doctrine, mankind must submit to the Church in which Christ deposited the truths which He enunciated on the earth. It is as unflinching in regards to morals as it is to doctrine ; it is antagonistic to the utilitarian school, and τὸ δέον, what we ought to do, covers its whole ethical system. The Church emphasises this system by inculcating what is known as the counsels of perfection, and thereby also emphasises its antagonism to the utilitarian school ; it venerates not only those who do what they "ought to do," but those who disregard their individual happiness and devote their whole lives to contriving the happiness and good of others, by educating the young, attending the sick, and consoling the dying.

This digression in the history of the Church has

been written because it appeared to be advisable at the outset to state generally the claims of the Church, inasmuch as the actions and decrees of the Popes and Councils are the natural sequence to the claim of authority on the part of the Church.

The history of the Church is in a great measure the history of definition of doctrine, such definition being the consequence of error preached by irresponsible persons. In fact, dogmatic definitions by the Church have been the result of the Popes having to assert the truth in the face of erroneous opinions calculated to obscure or controvert Christ's teaching. Heresies have been the seed from which dogmatic definitions have sprung.

## CHAPTER II.

THE History of the Catholic Church may be divided into four periods :

1. From the foundation of the Christian Church to the first Ecumenical Council of Nice, A.D. 325.

2. From the Council of Nice to the second Council of Trullo, A.D. 692.

3. From the second Council of Trullo to the beginning of the Western schism by Luther, and to the Council of Trent, 1545—64.

4. From the Council of Trent to the Vatican Council and to the present time.

At the time of the birth of Christ the philosophers had to some extent prepared the way for the reception of Christian faith and Christian ethics. Even Paganism contained elements of good, and the popular mythological belief, though tainted with gross superstition, contained elements of a real religion exemplified by mysterious rites and sacrifices, which foreshadowed the mysteries of the true faith. The teaching of Socrates, as developed by Plato and Aristotle about the time of Christ, tended to inculcate belief in the dependence



on a Supreme Being and immortality ; hence the idea of moral responsibility grew daily stronger, and, under the influence of Christianity, assisted in forming the public conscience.

The political situation of the most important civilised nations was also very favourable to the reception of Christianity. The language and customs of Rome at the time of the birth of Christ were accepted by the races inhabiting the Western portion of the vast Roman Empire. In the East the civilisation of Greece found more favour and was subsequently introduced into Rome. The union of many nations under one government presented great advantages for sowing the seed of Christianity, and afforded every facility to the Apostles for carrying out the Divine commission, "Go ye forth into the whole world, and teach all nations."

Moreover, a very general knowledge of the Greek language was another efficient means of propagating Christianity. St. Paul wrote in Greek to the Corinthians, to the Philippians, to the Asiatics of Ephesus, and to the Europeans of Rome in the West.

According to ancient prophecy, which grew more precise as time went on, the Messiah was to come among the Jews to destroy sin and regenerate mankind.

He was to be conceived in the womb of a virgin of the house of David, and to be born at Bethlehem, in the land of Judah. When the appointed time came, the Virgin Mary, then residing at Nazareth, was saluted by the Angel Gabriel: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee; and therefore also the Holy which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." When the time of the birth of Christ had come the Emperor Augustus ordered a census of the inhabitants of the empire, and the Blessed Virgin, in compliance with the decree, repaired to Bethlehem, and the prophecy as to the place of the birth of Christ was thus fulfilled.

In a stable at Bethlehem she gave birth to the Messiah, whom the Prophets saluted as the powerful God, the Father of the world to come, and the Prince of Peace.

The birth of Christ was accompanied by extraordinary events. We read in St. Luke:

"And there were in the same country shepherds watching, and keeping night watches over their flock.

"And behold an Angel of the Lord stood by them, and the brightness of God shone around them, and they feared with a great fear.

"And the Angel said to them: 'Fear not, for

behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, that shall be to all the people :

“ ‘ For this day is born to you a Saviour, Who is Christ the Lord, in the city of David.

“ ‘ And this shall be a sign to you. You shall find the infant wrapped in swaddling clothes, and laid in a manger.’

“ And suddenly there was with the Angel a multitude of the heavenly army, praising God, and saying :

“ ‘ Glory to God in the highest : and on earth peace to men of goodwill.’ ”

With the exception of the Scripture records that Mary and Joseph took Jesus to Egypt in order to secure His escape from Herod, who sought His death, and until His appearance, in His twelfth year, in the Temple amidst the doctors, little is known of the life of Jesus.

Many years had elapsed before He commenced His work of public teaching, and in the Sermon on the Mount he laid down the fundamental principles of His doctrine.

It does not concern us here to dilate at any length as to Christ's teaching, it will be sufficient to note that the essence of His teaching was that we should lead spiritual lives and look for spiritual reward, and that it was antagonistic to worldly aspirations. This should be borne in mind, because

it explains the creation of the Monastic Orders which, in a measure at least, are based upon the text, "If thou would be perfect, sell all that thou hast and follow Me"—and because the Monastic Orders enter largely into the history of the Church.

The foundation of the Church, as distinguished from that of Christianity which was contemporaneous with the birth and the teaching of Christ, may be said to have had its root in the choice by Christ of His Apostles, and the selection of St. Peter as the rock upon which He said, "I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." After His resurrection He conferred upon His Apostles supernatural powers. "Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins ye shall retain, they are retained" (St. John xx. 22, 23). "You shall receive the power of the Holy Ghost coming upon you, and you shall be witnesses unto Me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts i. 8).

The same supernatural guidance which was afforded to the Prophets in the Old Testament was bestowed by Christ upon His Church. The Holy Ghost, we read in Acts i. 16, spoke by the mouth of David.

We have so far evidence of the foundation by

Christ of a visible, enduring, and infallible Church, and it is obvious that nothing short of a Church so constituted is adequate to the task of the preservation of the Christian faith in its integrity and purity, and to fulfil the Divine command to preach the Gospel to all nations.

Though the historical documents relating to the life of St. Peter are scanty, they are, nevertheless, sufficient to prove that he was the chief Pastor of the whole Church, and exercised the prerogatives of supremacy over the other Apostles. He presided over the election of Matthias to fill the place of Judas. He was the first to address the assembled multitude after the descent of the Holy Ghost ; spoke in the name of all the Apostles before the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem, performed the first miracle, pronounced the first and terrible sentence upon Ananias and Saphira ; and although St. Paul is called the Apostle of the Gentiles, St. Peter was the first to admit Gentiles into the Christian Church by the baptism of Cornelius the Centurion.

The reception of the Gentiles led to the first Council of the Church, over which St. Peter presided (Acts xv.)

The Gentiles had never been acquainted with the doctrines and ceremonies of the Jews. Some Jewish priests and Pharisees who had but recently come into the Church, however, wished to exact

of the Gentile converts the same conditions as those imposed upon Christians of Jewish origin. As these were extremely severe the Gentiles sent a deputation to Jerusalem, where the Apostles assembled in Council (A.D. 50—52). The Council decreed, in the "name of the Holy Ghost," to lay no further burden on the Gentile converts than that they should abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication. The origin of the Councils is undoubtedly derived from this Apostolic Synod, but theologians have not agreed as to whether they were instituted by Divine or human authority. To this it is answered that they are an Apostolic institution; but that the Apostles, when they instituted them, acted under a commission which they received from Christ, otherwise they would not have published the decisions of their Synods with the words: "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us" (Acts xv. 28, 29).

Later Synods have acted and spoken in the same conviction. Cyprian wrote in the name of the Council over which he presided, A.D. 252, to Pope Cornelius: "It seemed good to us, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit." The Synod of Arles, A.D. 314, expressed itself to the same effect: "It seemed good, therefore, in the presence of the Holy Ghost and His Angels."



The earliest Synods known to us were held about the middle of the second Christian century, in Asia Minor ; they were occasioned by the rise of Montanism.

It is opportune here to observe that there are different kinds of Synods :

1. The Universal or Ecumenical Councils, at which bishops and other privileged persons from all the ecclesiastical provinces of the world are summoned to be present under the presidency of the Pope or his legates, and are bound to attend, unless in case of reasonable hindrance ; and whose decisions are received by the whole Church. A Council may, however, be intended to be Ecumenical and be summoned as such, and nevertheless not receive the rank of an Ecumenical Synod—as when its progress is stopped, or when it does not accomplish its object, or for any reason does not receive the approval of the Pope. This was the case with the so-called Latrocinian or Robber-Synods at Ephesus, A.D. 449. The bishops were summoned, and the Papal legates present ; but violence was used, and the presidency refused to the Pope's legates : error so prevailed, and the Council was declared to be invalid.

2. Second in importance are the General Councils or Synods of the Latin or Greek Church, at which were present the bishops and other privileged persons, either of the whole Latin or



of the whole Greek Church. Thus, in the first instance, the Synod at Constantinople, A.D. 381, was a Greek or Eastern General Council ; but as this Synod was afterwards received by the West it acquired the rank of an Ecumenical Council.

There are other Synods of minor importance, such as the Synods held by bishops of one patriarchate ; Synods of United Provinces ; Provincial Synods formed by the Metropolitan of an ecclesiastical province with his suffragan bishops ; Diocesan Synods held by the bishop with his clergy.

There have also been Synods of Residents, and a few mixed Councils, the former held at Constantinople when the Patriarch assembled around him bishops from different provinces or patriarchates who might be at Constantinople, for discussion of important subjects ; the latter were assemblies in which the ecclesiastical or the civil rulers of a kingdom met together in order to discuss affairs of Church and State. They were mostly held in the beginning of the Middle Ages, not unfrequently in France, Germany, England, Spain, and Italy, and the decisions were often promulgated in the form of Royal decrees.

In the history of the Church our attention will chiefly be directed to the great Ecumenical Councils, whose decrees have the force of law for all the faithful.

We may pass over the labours of St. Peter and St. Paul recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, as well as that of the other Apostles, who were likewise engaged in spreading the Christian faith, but of whom little can be gathered from the Scriptures ; it is sufficient here to record the rapidity with which Christianity spread throughout Asia, in Palestine and Syria, in Asia Minor and Mesopotamia, at Cæsarea and Antioch, Damascus and Edessa—in Europe, and particularly in Greece, in Macedonia, in Africa, and notably in Egypt.

The numerous Churches founded by the Apostles were governed by bishops ; thus from the earliest period of Christianity we have the Hierarchy instituted. These bishops were invested with the fulness of Apostolic power and authority, but limited both in extent and jurisdiction. That the bishop during the first three centuries was everywhere the head of his church, and the clergy subject to his jurisdiction, can easily be proved by history ; but, nevertheless, we find that the supremacy was vested in the See of Rome. Pope Clement, a father of the Apostolic age, and the third successor of St. Peter at Rome, A.D. 92—101, exercised his authority to put an end to a discord which had broken out at Corinth, though this Church was not within his immediate episcopal jurisdiction, on which occasion he refused to depose priests of blameless lives and faithful ministry.

Christian doctrine was not so dogmatically defined in early times as it has since been under the authority of the Popes and Ecumenical Councils. Nevertheless, we have from the first clear and decisive teaching on vital and fundamental matters. Baptism was, by Divine precept, the necessary condition of entrance into the Christian Church. The marriage tie was rendered indissoluble. Confession and sacramental absolution by the Apostles (St. John xx. 22, 23). The celebration of the Last Supper (St. Matt. xxvi. 26, 27, 28). Fasting (St. Matt. xvii. 20).

The claim of the Church to discipline in matters of faith we find enforced by the Apostles. They insisted upon unity of faith (1 Tim. vi. 3). St. Peter (2 Peter ii. 1) warns us against false teachers. They demanded full obedience to their precepts, and entire acceptance of their doctrines. St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians i. 8 : " Even though an angel from Heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema."

### CHAPTER III.

IN Asia, as early as A.D. 106, Churches were established in Nicomedia, Prusa, Cæsarea, and other places. There was a bishopric at Bostra at a very early date, and at other places in Arabia about the middle of the third century.

St. Mark the Evangelist carried the Faith into Africa, and became first Bishop of Alexandria ; but the influence of the Jews and the Gnostics seriously interfered with the founding of Churches and the establishment of bishoprics.

Carthage became the Metropolitan See of the African Churches, and Christianity spread into Numidia and Mauritania ; and its progress increased so rapidly that Tertullian, the famous priest of Carthage, declared, A.D. 202, that throughout the cities of Africa the Christians almost outnumbered the Pagans, and towards the close of the second century Agrippinus, Bishop of Carthage, presided over a Synod of seventy bishops of Africa and Numidia.

In Europe, St. Paul and his fellow-labourers laid the foundation of the Church in Greece, but the

most flourishing of all the Churches of Italy was beyond all question that of Rome. Besides St. Peter and St. Paul there were, as Tacitus affirms, great numbers put to death, by every species of cruel torture, during the persecution of Nero ; and the heroic fortitude and joy with which so many laid down their lives for the Faith inspired feelings of admiration for them in the breasts of others. Their blood, as Tertullian observes, was the seed of Christianity.

Many Churches of Italy were founded either by the contemporaries of the Apostles or their immediate disciples, such as the Church of Lucca, of Milan, of Ravenna, of Aquileia, of Bologna, of Benevento, Capua and Naples, Palermo and Syracuse in Sicily. Churches were also founded at Pavia, Urbino, Mantua, Verona, Pisa, Florence, and Siena. There is no positive proof that St. Paul preached the Gospel in Spain, but historians of the third century mention the Churches of Leon, Astorga, Cæsar Augusta, Tarragona, and others, which the Spanish writers affirm were founded by the seven bishops, Torquatus, Ctesiphon, Secundus, Indaletius, Hesychius, and Ephrasius, whom St. Peter and St. Paul sent as missionaries to Spain.

In Gaul the conquests of Cæsar were the means of introducing the mythology of Rome, and under-

mining the primitive faith; and the Gauls, dissatisfied with their existing condition, were prepared to receive the Apostles of the Gospel sent thither from Asia Minor.

Historians date back to the second century the foundation of Churches at Lyons and Vienna.

Churches at Toulouse, Narbonne, Arles, Clermont, Limoges, Tours, and Paris were undoubtedly in existence about the middle of the third century. Three of these Churches, viz., the Church of Toulouse, of Clermont, and of Tours, can produce historical proofs in favour of their Apostolic origin; the remainder owe their existence to the energetic efforts of Fabian, Bishop of Rome.

The influence of the Druids was very sensibly weakened in Britain, as well as in Gaul, by the mythology of Rome; and Tertullian asserts that Christianity made greater conquests than the Romans themselves. Venerable Bede states that Lucius, a British prince, obtained Christian teachers from Pope Eleutherius (177—192), but the edicts of Diocletian (284—305) were carried out with great severity in the Church of Britain. St. Alban was the first British Martyr. Nevertheless, three bishops from Britain, viz., those of York, London, and Lincoln, were present at the celebrated Synod of Arles (A.D. 314), to which we will presently refer.



In early times numerous heresies sprang up, and amongst other matters the important question of baptism was discussed at the Synod of Carthage (A.D. 218—222), when the bishops assembled declared every baptism conferred by heretics (*i.e.*, by Montanists and others who, as they adored the same Father and the same Son as the Catholics, were Christians) to be invalid. The re-admission to the Church of the *lapsi* (*i.e.*, those who had fallen away and shown weakness during persecution) was also debated.

Another controversy was held in Arabia as to whether the soul fell asleep with the body to awake at the resurrection of the body.

In A.D. 252 St. Cyprian, the Bishop of Carthage, assembled a Council at that city, when, among other matters, was considered the opinion expressed by the African Bishop Fidus that infants should be baptised, not in the first days after their birth, but eight days after. The Synod unanimously condemned this opinion, declaring that they could not thus delay to confer grace on the new-born.

In A.D. 256 Cyprian assembled a fresh Synod at Carthage, at which it was declared that baptism of heretics is invalid. This occasioned a conflict with Pope Stephen, who was so little pleased with the decision of the Synod of Carthage that he re-



fused to see or communicate with the deputies of the African bishops. Persecution soon after broke out against the Christians, A.D. 257, in which year Pope Stephen died as a Martyr, and probably appeased the controversy.

Synods were held at Antioch (264—269), when Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, who filled the highest See in the East, was deposed and excommunicated, on account of his anti-Trinitarian opinions. The Synod, before dissolving itself, sent to Dionysius, Bishop of Rome, and to Maximus of Alexandria, an Encyclical Letter ; but Dionysius having died in December, 269, the letter was given to his successor, Felix, who immediately wrote to Bishop Maximus and the clergy of Alexandria, to define the orthodox faith of the Church with greater clearness against the errors of Paul of Samosata. The Synod of Antioch, at which Paul was convicted of error, and subsequently deposed, terminated the Synods of the third century.

It has been asserted that in A.D. 303 a Synod was held at Sinuessa, situated between Rome and Capua ; but the authority on which this Synod rests has been unanimously rejected by both Catholics and Protestants, and it is only here referred to in order to show to what lengths a contentious spirit at times prevailed. The so-called Synod

never took place, and it is beyond all doubt that the documents put forward in support of its having been held is an amplification of the falsehood spread by the Donatists in A.D. 400.

We may pass over the Synod of Circa (305), at which certain bishops and others were accused of having, under an edict of Diocletian, delivered up the sacred writings ; also the Synod of Alexandria (306), when Meletius, Bishop of Lycopolis, was deposed for different offences and for having sacrificed to idols.

In 305 or 306 was held the Spanish Synod of Elvira, at which nineteen bishops were present, amongst others Hosius, afterwards so famous in the Arian controversy as Bishop of Cordova. The bishops represented the various Sees in Spain, and the Synod may be considered as representing the whole of that country.

This Synod is of importance, as it has been, more than any other, an occasion for many learned researches and controversies. Eighty-one authentic canons were promulgated by the Synod. Some of the decisions arrived at were afterwards set aside. The matters treated of relate to baptism, the *lapsi*, penances, breaches of marital fidelity, discipline, the use of images in churches. The last canon (the 81st) imposes upon married women disabilities which would be looked upon with

dismay in these days of "Women's Rights." It directs that women must not write in their own name to lay-Christians, they may only do so in the name of their husbands ; nor must they receive letters of friendship from any one, addressed only to themselves.

In the years A.D. 311—313 Synods were held on account of the schism of the Donatists. Donatus, Bishop of Casa-Nigrae in Numidia, accused Mensurius, Bishop of Carthage, of having, during Diocletian's persecution, delivered up the Holy Scriptures. The Donatists subsequently attacked the election of Cecilian, the successor to Mensurius in the See of Carthage. The dispute was investigated at a Synod held at Rome (313), when Donatus was condemned.

In A.D. 314 an important Synod was held at Arles. The Emperor Constantine the Great invited several bishops. The number of bishops present is variously calculated. The Synod of Arles may be looked upon as a General Council of the West (or of the Roman Patriarchate); but although Pope Sylvester was represented by two priests, Claudianus and Vitus, and two deacons, Eugenius and Cyriacus, it does not rank as an Ecumenical Council, because other patriarchs were not invited to it. Twenty-six authentic canons were promulgated at this Synod.

The 1st Canon directs that Easter be observed on the same date throughout the whole world. The 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th relate to matters of discipline—interdict the games of the gladiators, and excommunicate those who are employed in theatres. The 7th repeats a similar statute of the Synod of Elvira, which forbade that a Christian invested with a public office should appear in church during the term of those duties, because these necessarily brought him into contact with Paganism ; but an essential change had taken place since that Synod was held. Constantine had become a Christian, and it was necessary that under a Christian emperor the former rigour should be relaxed, and the canon of Arles therefore modified that of Elvira. The 8th abolished the decree of African Synods that whoever had been baptised by a heretic must be rebaptised ; it decreed that in such cases imposition of hands only was required in token of reconciliation. The rule promulgated by this 8th Canon has always been in force, and is still preserved in our time. It was adopted and renewed by the 19th Canon of the Ecumenical Council of Nicœa. The 9th relates to a matter of ecclesiastical discipline ; the 10th prohibits the innocent party, in cases of infidelity to the marriage vow, from marrying again ; the 11th imposes a penalty for breach of moral con-

duct ; the 12th forbids usury, the 13th relates to ordination of the clergy, the 14th denounces false witnesses, the 15th relates to ecclesiastical discipline in regard to offering the Holy Sacrifice, the 16th to the reconciliation to the Church of excommunicated persons, the 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th, and 21st to ecclesiastical discipline, and the 22nd forbids the administering of Communion to public sinners who have not done penance.

Almost simultaneously with the Synod of Arles were held the Synods of Ancyra and Neo-cæsarea. Twenty-four canons were promulgated at the former Synod, which was in a great measure occupied with considering the conditions upon which the *lapsi* could be readmitted to communion in the Church, and the penances to be undergone by those who had sinned grievously and openly against morals.

Fifteen canons were promulgated by the latter Synod, relating to ecclesiastical discipline and morals.

The student will, perhaps, be disappointed at this very meagre reference to early Synods, and be inclined to say, rather than give so little, it would have been even better to have passed them over with the bare mention of them and the dates at which they were held ; but this course would not have been satisfactory, as it is desirable to give the

reader a general idea, in order of time, of the progress of the Church and of matters which were debated in Synods prior to the first Ecumenical Council of Nicœa, at which Council many questions which had been debated at previous Synods were reopened, re-considered, and determined on the indisputable authority of an Ecumenical Council.

Before entering upon the important Council of Nicœa attention should be directed to Arianism, which was prominently the occasion of the Nicene Council.

Arius was a priest of Alexandria. In contradiction to the doctrine of the Church that the Son (the Logos) is consubstantial and co-eternal with the Father, he favoured an inequality and subordination in the three Persons of the Holy Trinity.

The Church of Alexandria was a specially prepared soil for philosophical and metaphysical discussion, and to this the development of Arianism is in a great measure to be attributed ; indeed, many of the controversies on which the early Synods turned, moved in the sphere of Grecian and Oriental metaphysics. They were such as no Western mind could have originated. The doctrine of Arius made such progress that his bishop, Alexander, called together his clergy and made them argue in his presence with Arius ; they proclaimed the Son consubstantial and co-eternal



with the Father. Arius, however, did not submit ; on the contrary, he sent to several bishops a written confession of faith, and begged of them to intercede with Alexander. Alexander then seeing the uselessness of his efforts, convoked (320) a large ecclesiastical assembly in Alexandria, at which were present nearly one hundred Egyptian and Libyan bishops, and at which Arius and his partisans were anathematised.

Although excommunicated, Arius continued to hold congregations for Divine service; and his doctrine having become more dangerous on account of the open partisanship bestowed on it by Eusebius of Nicomedia, who was then bishop in the household of Constantine and his sister, Constantia, and exercised great influence over them, Alexander convoked a new assembly, and asked all the united clergy (among these Athanasius, then a deacon) to sign his Encyclical Letter.

In this document Alexander complained of Eusebius of Nicomedia, who had undertaken to protect the heresy ; he enumerated the names of the apostates, and exposed their chief errors. The errors which he enumerated throw much light upon the doctrine promulgated by Eusebius and the Arians, and are as follow :

- I. God was not always Father ; there was a time when He was not Father.



2. The Logos of God has not always been ; He was created from nothing ; God the self-existent, created from nothing Him Who is not self-existent.

3. There was a time when He was not.

4. The Son is a creature.

5. He is not of the same substance of the Father ; He is not truly and according to His nature the Word and the Wisdom of God, but one of the works and of the creatures of God.

6. By nature He is subject to change (hence by nature liable to sin).

7. He differs from the Divine nature.

8. He would not have existed had He not been called into existence by God through love of us.

It will be gathered from the above enumeration of errors, which in some cases are here condensed, that the doctrine of Arius practically denied that the Logos was of the substance of the Father, and asserted that the Logos was created—in fact, that the Son was a creature.

Alexander afterwards refuted these Arian doctrines by texts from the Holy Scriptures ; but the Arians endeavoured by falsehoods and by concealing their errors to bring other bishops over to their side, and many of them succeeded in being admitted into the communion of the Church.

Arius, driven from Alexandria by his bishop, went first to Palestine, from whence he complained

of the persecution he had suffered at the hands of Alexander ; and with the object of sustaining his views he misrepresented the doctrine enunciated by Alexander. He afterwards went to Nicomedia, where he wrote his principal work, called *θάλεια*, "The Banquet," in which he repeated his former errors.

Arius subsequently returned to Alexandria ; and the disputes still raging, Constantine attempted by letters, of which Hosius was the bearer, to Arius and Bishop Alexander, to pacify the disputants, but without any result being attained. And the Emperor then, as a means of re-establishing peace in the Church, determined to summon a general assembly of the bishops of his empire to be held at Nicœa.

## CHAPTER IV.

---

THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA, A.D. 325, STYLED THE  
“GREAT AND HOLY SYNOD.”

THE bishops were desired, by letters of invitation, by the Emperor Constantine the Great, to repair to Nicæa. That the invitation was responded to with alacrity is proved by the fact that no less than three hundred and eighteen bishops attended the Council : of this number only eight came from the West.

The Council, although Ecumenical, was in its general character Eastern ; that is to say, the subjects discussed in the assemblies, and the occasions which called them together, were especially Eastern or Greek.

It is impossible to determine whether the Emperor Constantine acted only in his own name, or in concert with the Pope in assembling the bishops ; but in the Sixth Ecumenical Council (A.D. 680) it is stated that Arius, having arisen as an adversary to the doctrine of the Trinity, Constantine and Pope Silvester immediately as-

sembled the great Synod at Nicœa. Rufinus states that Constantine summoned the assembly upon the advice of the most eminent bishops ; and if he consulted several bishops he certainly would have taken the advice of the first among them.

The testimony of this Council is of great importance. If it had been held in the West or at Rome, what it says might appear suspicious to some critics ; but it took place in the East, at a period when the bishops were beginning to be rivals to those of Rome : moreover, the Greeks formed greatly the majority in the members of the Council, and consequently their testimony in favour of the co-operation of Pope Silvester is very valuable.

The Council of Nicœa was, from an historical as well as a religious point of view, the greatest event which affected the whole Church since the close of the Apostolic age. In the two preceding centuries we have seen that there were many stirring incidents, but all isolated and fragmentary. At Nicœa, for the first time, the Church meets the Empire face to face. It is one of those moments in the history of the world which occur once, and cannot be repeated. It is the first point whence we can look forward to the comparatively smooth and easy course which the Church pursued in future centuries.

The decision of the Council in promulgating the Nicene Creed is of the highest importance.

Its importance will be appreciated if we consider that the doctrine of the Holy Trinity was at stake. The Arian heresy, although it did not directly attack the Divinity of Christ, nevertheless, by denying that He was co-eternal and consubstantial with the Father, reduced Him to the position of a created being, a creature.

The Nicene Creed may be truly said to be the key to Christian theology ; and amidst the various heresies and disputes which have since arisen, that Creed alone retains its hold upon the mass of Christendom. It is accepted by the Eastern, Western, and Protestant Churches.

The town of Nicœa was chosen as being very favourable for a large concourse of bishops. Constantinople had not yet been founded. Nicœa was situated upon one of the rivers flowing into the Propontis, and was easy to reach by water for the bishops of almost all the provinces, especially for those of Asia, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Greece, and Thrace ; it was a much frequented commercial city, and not far distant from the Imperial residence in Nicomedia. After the lapse of many centuries, and under Turkish rule, it has fallen from its ancient splendour, and now under the name Isnik numbers

a population of scarcely fifteen thousand inhabitants, fewer than the number of guests it contained at the time of the Council.

The number of bishops who attended the Council is variously stated ; it probably varied according to the month. The bishops came, says Eusebius, as fast as they could run, in almost a frenzy of excitement and enthusiasm ; and from the first there could not have been less than two hundred, but finally the number is reckoned at three hundred and eighteen. St. Athanasius, who was an eye-witness, in his letter, *ad Afros*, speaks expressly of three hundred and eighteen. Most of the bishops were Greeks ; the Latin group was numerically very small.

The diversity of the persons, as well as of character, is a matter of great interest.

In the Latin group was the celebrated Hosius, Bishop of Cordova—the world-renowned Spaniard, as he is called by Eusebius. He was the representative of the Western Church, and was the chief counsellor of the Emperor in the Latin Church, as Eusebius of Cæsarea was in the Greek Church. Cecilian of Carthage, Marcus of Calabria, Nicosius of Dijon, Domnus of Stridon (in Pannonia), and two Roman priests, Victor and Vincentius, representatives of Pope Silvester. In the Egyptian group, first and foremost was the

aged Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria ; close beside Alexander was the Deacon of Alexandria, the most vehement opponent of the Arians ; the great Athanasius—a small, insignificant young man, twenty-four years of age, of lively manners and speech, and of bright serene countenance, who, to the faith and gifts of an Apostle, and to the heroic courage and fortitude of a Martyr, added the keen penetration and dialectic skill of a philosopher, and the persuasive power and sweeping eloquence of a true orator.

In the Egyptian group was also the incumbent of the parish church of Baucalis, the renowned Arius. He had been a pupil of Lucian, a priest of Antioch, and had acquired a rich store of learning while under his distinguished master, was naturally eloquent, possessed a cultivated mind, was trained in rhetorical and dialectic habits of thought, so characteristic of the school of Antioch. In appearance he presented a marked contrast to Athanasius. He was sixty years of age, tall and thin ; in demeanour austere and ascetic ; he was proud and arrogant, yet of very fascinating manners. Close beside him was a group of his countrymen, of whom we know little, except their fidelity to him through good and evil report.

These were the most remarkable deputies from the Church of Alexandria ; but from the interior of



Africa came characters of quite another stamp, not Greeks, but genuine Copts, who could speak the Greek language not at all, or with great difficulty. Among them were Potamon, Bishop of Heracleopolis, far up the Nile, who had lost one eye in the last persecution ; and Paphnutius, Bishop of Upper Thebaid. Paphnutius had his right eye bored out and his knees cut off during the persecution of Maximin. The Emperor Constantine esteemed him so highly that he frequently invited him to his palace, and devoutly kissed the socket of the eye which he had lost.

From Syria the most remarkable was Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, the father of ecclesiastical history, who, perhaps, alone of the Eastern prelates, could tell what was in the mind of the Emperor. He was the chaplain and confessor of the Emperor, and he was, up to a certain point, in sympathy with the Arians.

From Asia Minor came Eusebius of Nicomedia, a resolute defender of Arius ; and as Athanasius was called "the Great," by the orthodox, Eusebius was so called by the Arians.

From Cyprus came Spirydion, the shepherd Bishop of Cyprus, who proved a formidable accession of strength to the orthodox.

Among the many bishops who attended at the Council, some were celebrated for their wisdom,

others for the austerity of their lives, others for their modesty; some were very old, some very young; many had suffered persecution and bore in their bodies the marks of Christ.

Preparatory conferences and discussions took place between the Catholics, the Arians, and the philosophers. Arius was invited to take part in them, and his supporters, including seventeen bishops, spoke in his favour. On the orthodox side Athanasius, and the priest Alexander of Constantinople, vested with power by his old bishop, chiefly opposed the Arians.

During these preparatory conferences the Emperor arrived, and the Synod was solemnly opened by him.

The meetings of the representatives had up to this time been held in the church or gymnasium, or in separate localities, but were henceforth solemnised in the Imperial residence.

When the arrival of the Emperor was announced, the whole assembly rose and stood on their feet, and cast their admiring gaze on Constantine. His towering stature, his strongly built frame, his broad shoulders, his handsome features, were worthy of his magnificent position. He was full of grace and majesty. The bishops were further struck by the magnificence of his dress. His purple and scarlet robe blazed with precious stones and gold embroidery.

The bishop on his right (probably Eusebius of Cæsarea) addressed a short speech to the Emperor, in which he thanked God for having given him such an Emperor. After he had resumed his seat the Emperor, in a voice of gentleness and sweetness which arrested the attention of all, spoke as follows :

“ My greatest desire, my friends, was to see you assembled. I thank God that to all the favours He has granted me, He has added the greatest, that of seeing you all here, animated by the same feeling. May no mischievous enemy come now to deprive us of this happiness ! And, after we have conquered the enemies of Christ, let not the evil spirit attempt to dishonour the law of God with new blasphemies ! I consider disunion in the Church an evil more terrible and more grievous than any kind of war. After having, by the grace of God, conquered my enemies, I thought nothing more remained but to give God thanks, and to rejoice with those whom I had delivered. But since I learned that division had arisen among you, I became convinced that I ought not to attend to any business before this ; and it is from the desire of being useful to you that I have convened you without delay. I shall not believe my end to be attained until I have united the minds of all ; until I see that peace and union reign

among you which you are commissioned, as the anointed of the Lord, to preach to others. Do not hesitate, my friends ; do not hesitate, ye servants of God : banish all causes of dissension ; solve controversial difficulties according to the laws of peace, so as to accomplish the work which shall be most agreeable to God, and cause me, your fellow-servant, an infinite joy."

Constantine spoke in Latin ; and when his address was concluded the Imperial dragoman or interpreter translated it into Greek.

The Emperor had opened the Council, and continued to be present at it ; but he left the settlement of theological discussions to the ecclesiastical leaders of the Council.

On the one side of the Emperor sat his Western favourite, Hosius of Cordova ; and on the other side his Eastern favourite, Eusebius of Cæsarea.

Hosius presided at the assembly as Papal legate in union with the two Roman priests, Victor and Vincentius. This may be inferred from the fact that, although many variations in the manuscripts are to be found in the order of the signatures of the Council, in every copy, without one exception, Hosius and the two Roman priests signed first, and this notwithstanding that Hosius was inferior in rank to the Patriarch of Alexandria, and that the Roman priests had no right to sign for themselves.

After them came the signature of Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria.

The discussions between the orthodox and Arians, which had commenced before the first solemn session of the Council, continued in the Emperor's presence. Arius was often called into the midst of the assembly. There was a third party, led by Eusebius of Nicomedia, who favoured the Arians; and Eusebius of Cæsarea often sided with them, although more averse to Arianism than the Eusebians.

The Eusebians, when they found that the Council was against them, attempted to formulate a decision which, while it did not appear to assert a positive subordination of the Logos, nevertheless did not prevent such a construction being put upon it.

Eusebius of Cæsarea made a last attempt to get rid of the expression *ὁμοούσιος* (of the same substance, or consubstantial with the Father), and proposed a creed for adoption by the assembly, the objectionable word being, however, omitted.

The bishops, therefore, in order to exclude dishonest interpretation, insisted upon the insertion of the word *ὁμοούσιους*.

Hosius and Athanasius were prominent in sustaining the orthodox view, and when that view had attained the assent of the Council, Hosius

rose and announced the completion of the Faith or Creed of the Council of Nicœa. The Creed was written out, and then read by Hermogenes, a deacon of Cæsarea, who acted as Secretary to the Council. It is as follows :

“ We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Creator of all things visible and invisible ; and in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, only begotten of the Father (that is, of the substance of the Father), God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God ; begotten, not made ; being of the same substance with the Father, by Whom all things were made in Heaven and in earth, Who for us men and for our salvation came down from Heaven, was incarnate, was made man, suffered, rose again the third day, ascended into the heavens, and He will come to judge the living and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost.”

“ Those who say there was a time when He was not before He was begotten, and He was made of nothing (He was created), or who say that He was of another hypostasis, or of another substance (than the Father), or that the Son of God is created, that He is mutable or subject to change, the Catholic Church anathematizes.”

The Creed was accepted by all the bishops except five. In the end all signed except Theonas of Marmarica and Secundus of Ptolemais. Arius



and these bishops were excommunicated and exiled, as was also later Eusebius of Nicomedia. The books of Arius were burnt.

The remaining questions of importance to be settled by the Council were the Meletian Schism and the question of Easter. As regards the former, Meletius, Bishop of Lycopolis, had taken the severer view of the case of the lapsed than his episcopal brother of Alexandria. The Council decided, maybe influenced by the fact of Meletius' orthodoxy, that he should retain his See, but not ordain.

The latter question, that of the date for the observance of Easter, was reduced to almost complete uniformity; and the table which may now be referred to in the Prayer Book originated in the Council of Nicœa.

It is creditable to the Council that, notwithstanding the countenance he had given to Arius, Eusebius of Cæsarea, in acknowledgment of his great learning, should have been entrusted with this work.

This decree was not prefaced with the words, "So believes the Catholic Church," as was the case of the Creed, but with the words, "It has been determined by common consent"; apparently to show that this was a matter of mere outward arrangement.

The Synod also enacted twenty canons. The



1st is aimed against acts of excessive asceticism ; the 2nd restrains the rapid transition of converts from heathenism to baptism ; the 3rd guards against scandals which might arise from intimate companionship of the clergy with religious women who were not their mothers, sisters, or aunts ; the 4th, 5th, 6th, 15th, 16th, 17th, and 18th relate to clerical jurisdiction and usury. The remaining canons relate, for the most part, to the settlements of cases of conscience which arose in dealing with those who had given way in the recent persecutions, such as the conditions upon which the *lapsi* should be readmitted to the Church ; of these the 13th forbids that any one at the point of death should be deprived of the last viaticum.

Athanasius, on the death of Alexander, Archbishop of Alexandria, and when only thirty years of age, was selected to fill that important See (A.D. 328), and was ever afterwards an uncompromising antagonist of the Arians ; and although he endured, during the period of forty-six years of his episcopate, all the hardships of five successive terms of exile, his resolute soul remained unsubdued.

A change subsequently came over the Emperor, and Arius and the banished Arian bishops were recalled (A.D. 328). Arius endeavoured, by Court

favour and pretending to conform his faith to the decrees of the Nicene Council, to conciliate the goodwill of the Emperor, who was deceived by his specious professions ; and by the influence of Arius and his supporters, Athanasius was, at the Synod of Tyre (A.D. 335), unjustly deposed, but Constantine refused the demand that the See should be filled by another bishop.

Constantine died in A.D. 337, and in compliance with the desire expressed by him before his death Athanasius was recalled and reinstated by the Emperor's son, Constantine the younger.

## CHAPTER V.

---

### THE SECOND GENERAL COUNCIL, HELD AT CONSTANTINOPLE IN 381.

BEFORE continuing the sequence of the progress of the Church, it is desirable to refer to the important part played by Constantine in freeing the Church from the control of the secular powers.

Before the coming of Christ man was viewed only in his temporal, social, and political aspect, and Constantine may be said to have divided two halves of history. Until his time the ancient world lived amidst innumerable superstitions with religions equally base. With him we enter upon civilisation. His conquests and power were directed to good ends. He was moved by a spirit of magnanimity and humanity, and from his patronage we may date the consolidation of the Roman Church.

We have seen that at the Council of Nicœa Constantine left the settlement of theological matters to the bishops, and that Hosius and the two Roman priests, as representing the Pope,

signed the decrees first in the order of the signatures ; but it was not until the Synod of Sardica, in A.D. 344, in drawing up a number of canons relating to ecclesiastical discipline, that in the 3rd, 4th, and 5th Canons the right of appeal to the Bishop of Rome was explicitly set forth.

It would, nevertheless, be erroneous to suppose that from the time of Constantine the Great the Church was freed from attempted domination on the part of the Emperors. Constantius, who by the death of Constans, murdered (A.D. 350) by Magnentius, had become sole ruler of the whole Roman Empire, under the influence of the Arians, was guilty of many acts of Imperial violence ; and Pope Liberius, whom Constantius sought to gain by presents, rejected all his advances, and was sent into exile : and although after the death of Constantius Arianism in the West had more and more declined, in the Eastern Empire, especially under the Emperor Valens, it had constantly increased in strength, and at the same time in intolerance. The capital, Constantinople, formed a true picture of the Eastern Church. Here, the Episcopal See had been for forty years in the hands of the Arians. This sect was so powerful and predominant, that the Catholics no longer possessed a single one of the many churches in the city. At the death of the Emperor Valens

the East also came under the rule of the Emperor Gracian, who issued an edict of toleration (A.D. 379), and the Catholics then obtained a representative of their own (not a bishop, but a diocesan administrator) in the person of one of the greatest Fathers of the Church at that time, St. Gregory of Nazianzus. Gregory converted the house of one of his relatives into a church, and this poor chapel grew afterwards into the famous Church of the Resurrection.

About the same time that Gregory was summoned to Constantinople, the Emperor Gratian conferred upon his former general, "Theodosius," the dignity of joint Emperor with the government of the East.

From his own inner convictions, as well as from political reasons, Theodosius made it one of his chief duties to secure the religious unity of the kingdom upon the basis of the Nicene faith, and he required of all his subjects the confession of the orthodox faith. He obliged the Arians to restore to the orthodox all the churches and the whole of the Church property, and the Arian bishop was obliged to leave the place because he would not obey the Imperial commands to consent to the Nicene Creed.

In order to arrange the affairs of the Church, and above all to secure the triumph of the Nicene

faith in the East over Arianism, as well as over the heresy broached at the Synod of Alexandria (A.D. 362) with respect to the Holy Ghost, at which the Arians asserted that it was perfectly compatible with the Nicene Creed to declare that the Holy Ghost was a creature, Theodosius summoned a large Synod to meet at Constantinople, which assembled A.D. 381. Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, first presided ; after his death, Gregory, of Nazianzus ; and after he had resigned, his successor, Nectarius, Patriarch of Constantinople. This Synod subsequently ranked as the Second Ecumenical Council.

It did not so rank at this time ; Theodosius only summoned the bishops belonging to his division of the empire, and it was not until A.D. 600 that the Creed, but not the canons of the Synod, were accepted at Rome, and that Pope Gregory the Great reckoned it as one of the four Ecumenical Councils which he compares to the four Gospels. Several of the acts of the Council had been censured by a Council of the Latins, such as the choice of Nectarius as Bishop of Constantinople. The Creed is as follows :

“ We believe in one God, the ✠ Father Almighty, Creator of Heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten

of the Father before all times, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not created, of the same substance with the Father, by Whom all things were made ; Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from Heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man ; was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, He suffered and was buried, and the third day he rose again with glory to judge both the living and the dead ; Whose kingdom shall have no end. And we believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Life-giver, Who proceedeth from the Father ; Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified ; Who spake by the Prophets. And one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. We acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins. We look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen."

Until we come to the part of the Creed relating to the Holy Ghost, this Creed is almost identical with the Nicene Creed. In the Nicene Creed we only find the words, "And in the Holy Ghost." That Creed was, therefore, incomplete with regard to the doctrine of the Holy Ghost ; and this Creed, in enunciating the true doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost, put an end to the Arian heresy, broached at the Synod of Alexandria (A.D. 362).



The consensus of the whole Catholic Church having been given to this Creed, it was obvious that it should receive the ecumenical *imprimatur*; and that the Council of Constantinople, so far as the Creed is concerned, should rank as ecumenical, which it could not do in the first instance because the Oriental bishops only were summoned and took part in the deliberations. Nevertheless, the Greeks subsequently maintained that the Creed, even as amended at the General Council of Constantinople in 381, did not justify the belief that the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father included His procession from the Son; which led to a further decree, exhaustively defining the true doctrine, at the Ecumenical Council held at Florence in 1349.\*

The canons drawn up at this Synod are few in number, and, with the exception of the 3rd Canon, are not of the first importance. The 3rd Canon states :

“The Bishop of Constantinople shall hold the first rank after the Bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is new Rome.”

Some Greek writers have explained this canon in the sense that the preposition “after” only indicated posterity of time; but the Greek commentator Zonaras has combated this opinion, and

\* See Chapter X.

shows that the Emperor Justinian (A.D. 527), in the Fifth Book of his Imperial Constitutions, acknowledged a subjection of the See of Constantinople to that of Rome.

Several Synods were held between the Second General Council at Constantinople and the Third General Council held at Ephesus (A.D. 431); and at these Synods letters were addressed to the Emperor Theodosius, expressing a desire that he would summon the bishops of his empire to a fresh Synod, by which the heresy of the Arians, and other heresies relating to the "Incarnation," should be solemnly condemned. And a Synod was held at Constantinople (382), when a confession of faith was drawn up, acknowledging the oneness of the God-head of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

The bishops assembled at this Synod were nearly the same as those who had been present at the Second General Council. On their arrival at Constantinople they received a letter from the Synod of Milan, inviting them to a great General Council at Rome; and they sent as assurance of their friendship and unity three bishops with a Synodal Letter to Pope Damasus.

The Roman Synod was the fifth held under Damasus, and besides the Pope there were present many bishops, and the learned St. Jerome. No

acts of this assembly have come down to us ; but it said that by wish of the Pope, St. Jerome composed a confession of faith to be signed by the schismatics.

Notwithstanding the repeated condemnation of the Arians and other cognate heresies, the heresiarchs continued their efforts to spread their doctrine, and the Emperor in 383 summoned the bishops of the different parties to a great Synod at Constantinople. Each party prepared confessions of faith, and the Emperor ordered the destruction of all of them except the orthodox one, because they introduced a division of the Holy Trinity.

Synods were held at Bordeaux in 384, at Trèves in 385, at Rome in 386, and at Telepte about 418. At these Synods matters relating to ecclesiastical discipline were considered. The records are scanty ; but we learn from a Synodal Letter of Pope Siricius to the bishops of Africa that in January, 386, a Synod at Rome, consisting of eighty bishops, re-enacted various older laws of the Church, and that at this Synod the 1st Canon states : " No consecration (of a bishop) shall take place without the consent of the Apostolic See."

Two Synods were held at Carthage in 389 and 390. They were of no great importance. The 2nd Canon of the latter, however, emphasises the

celibacy of the clergy ; it binds bishops, priests, and levites to abstain from their wives.

In the latter year, 390, Synods were held at Rome and Milan. These Synods were occasioned by Jovinian and his heresy, and are interesting from the fact that he was the precursor of Luther, in that he held nearly the same views concerning good works. He taught (1) that virginity, married life, and widowhood were equally meritorious ; (2) that fasting was not more meritorious than eating, provided the latter was done with thanksgiving ; (3) that all who with full faith were born again in baptism, could not be overcome by the devil ; (4) that all who are saved by the grace of baptism may expect an equal reward in Heaven (a consequence of the former views is that there are no different degrees of moral virtue) ; (5) that Mary indeed conceived Christ as a virgin, but did not bear Him as a virgin, for through child-bearing her virginity ceased ; for otherwise we must say, with the Manicheans, that the body of Christ was not real, but only appeared so.

In conformity with this doctrine, Jovinian, who was a Monk, changed his former ascetic life for one of easy luxury. He repaired to Rome, and persuaded several consecrated virgins and ascetics to marry, asking them, " Are you better than Sarah, Susanna, Anna, and other holy persons of the

Bible?" Pope Siricius, at the Roman Synod, declared the doctrine of Jovinian to be contrary to Christian law, and Jovinian and others were expelled the Church; at the same time he communicated this decision to St. Ambrose, at Milan, who assembled a Synod, at which the Jovinian heretics were condemned.

A Synod was held at Capua in 391, and a more important Synod at Hippo in 393, at which St. Augustine, then still a priest at Hippo, delivered his discourse, *De Fide et Symbolo*, which is preserved to us in his work bearing the same title. The canons at Hippo relate mostly to ecclesiastical matters; the 28th Canon, however, directs that "The Sacrament of the Altar shall be observed fasting, except on the anniversary of its institution (Maundy Thursday); and the 36th Canon orders that "Besides the canonical Scriptures,\* nothing shall be read in the church under the title of 'Divine writings.'"

A Gallican Synod was held at Nîmes in 394, but nothing was known of this Synod till, in 1743, Rodérique brought its acts to light in his *Correspondance des Savants*, printed at Cologne.

The four first Carthaginian Synods, under Aurelius, Archbishop of Carthage, and the Synods of

\* For canonical Scriptures, see decree of Council of Trent, Chapter XII.

Adrumetum and Constantinople, were held 394—398. Not much is known in respect of these Synods, and various Synods were subsequently held at Alexandria, Jerusalem, Cyprus, Constantinople, Ephesus, Toledo, Milevi, and Turin, relating mostly to ecclesiastical matters.

In 402 a Roman Synod was held under Pope Innocent I., of which we still possess sixteen canons. They relate chiefly to matters concerning chastity; impose penances upon virgins who have taken the veil and who have committed acts of unchastity, and forbid a Christian to marry his deceased wife's sister.

A Synod was held at Constantinople in 404, at which certain charges were brought against St. Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople. St. Chrysostom was banished by the Emperor Arcadius, recalled, and subsequently, the result of intrigues, died in exile.

We may pass over Synods held from 403 to 411, at Carthage, Seleucia, Ptolemais, and Braga. In the last-mentioned year the Pelagian controversies occasioned a series of new Synods. Pelagius asserted: (1) Adam would have died even if he had not sinned. (2) The sin of Adam injured himself alone, and not all mankind. (3) New-born children are in the same condition in which Adam was before the Fall. (4) It is not true that,



because of the death and sin of Adam, all mankind die ; neither is it true that, because of Christ's resurrection, all men rise again. (5) The law leads to Heaven as well as the Gospel. (6) Even before the coming of Christ there were men who were entirely without sin. The Pelagian heresies were considered at Synods held at Carthage, Jerusalem, Diospolis, Rome, and Milevi ; but in 418 an African General Synod was held at Carthage, when canons against Pelagianism were promulgated.

Before the Pelagian heresy had been fully decided, another matter of great interest gave rise to several New African Synods. A priest, Apiarius of Sicca, had, on account of various offences, been deposed and excommunicated by his bishop. He went to Rome, appealed to Pope Zosimus, who demanded his reinstatement. The action of the Pope caused displeasure to the Africans, and Archbishop Aurelius assembled a Synod of bishops (A.D. 418), before whom the Papal legates appeared ; they claimed the right of appeal to Rome, basing their claim erroneously upon the Nicene Canons, which, however, were really Sardican, at which Synod, as we have already seen, appeal to the Pope was authorised. The acts of the orthodox Synod of Sardica were not, however, known in Africa ; but, out of respect for Rome, the bishops made a written declaration that, until



further investigation, they would accept the pretended canons of Nicœa. Apiarius subsequently asked forgiveness of his fault, and was received into communion. Apiarius afterwards, however, demanded a fresh investigation, at which shocking actions committed by him were brought to light. He subsequently confessed all his crimes, and was excommunicated ; and the African bishops begged the Pope not in future to lend a willing ear to those who came to Rome from Africa.

A new Synod was held at Carthage (A.D. 426) in consequence of the Monk Leporius of Marseilles having taught what by inference might be held to give a false view of the Divinity of Christ. In order not to humanise the Divine, he did not wish to say absolutely that God Himself is born of Mary, but rather that God the perfect man is born of Mary. His doctrine thus by inference introduced a fourth person into the Trinity. Leporius acknowledged his error, but alleged that he had not knowingly offended.

## CHAPTER VI.

---

### THE THIRD ECUMENICAL COUNCIL AT EPHESUS, A.D. 431.

BEFORE proceeding to discuss the Synod at Ephesus, we think it useful to remind the reader of the history of the Church up to this date. The first step in the history of the Church was the founding of numerous Churches by the Apostles. We then entered upon a period of persecution of the Christians, and the numerous differences of opinion which obtained in regard to ecclesiastical discipline, and particularly with regard to the conditions upon which those who had lapsed from the Faith should be re-admitted to communion. We next reached the period when serious heresies relating to doctrine in regard to the nature of Our Lord were maintained, which resulted in the convocation of the First Ecumenical Council at Nicœa, when the Nicene Creed was promulgated as the basis of faith, so far as the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son were concerned ; but as it was afterwards alleged that it was com-

patible with the Creed to declare that the Holy Ghost was a creature, the Creed was amplified at the Second Ecumenical Council, held at Constantinople, and the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity more fully stated.

Having reached this point, we shall now find ourselves confronted with the errors propagated by Nestorius, which led to the Third Ecumenical Synod at Ephesus.

The Church had maintained, in opposition to the Docetæ, the true manhood of Christ; in opposition to the Arians and others, His true Godhead. The question arose: In what manner the Divine and human natures in Christ were united. The fact that they were closely united was an established portion of the faith of the Church, but the manner of the union had not yet become the subject of exact consideration. Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, the learned Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea, and others, while they brought the humanity and Divinity in Christ into unity so that these were not merely in juxtaposition, but one and yet distinct, nevertheless, in their teaching, left it open to the construction that there was no true God-man, and consequently no true and perfect manhood of the Redeemer.

In connection with this controversy the name of Nestorius pre-eminently stands forth. Born at

Germanicia, a city of Syria, Nestorius came to Antioch. He shortly afterwards entered the Monastery of Euprepus at Antioch, and thence was appointed priest in the Cathedral of Antioch. He was greatly distinguished for his preaching, and enjoyed the reputation of being a rigid ascetic ; and in consequence of the favour he acquired, he was subsequently appointed Bishop of Constantinople.

Nestorius attacked many heresies, but showed favour to the Pelagians in so much as he appears to have regarded as correct their doctrine of the sufficiency of man's free will for the accomplishment of whatever is good ; but not their view on original sin. It was during these transactions in connection with the Pelagians that the controversy began with which the name of Nestorius is so sadly associated. The controversy arose in this manner : one party designated the holy Virgin by the name of "God-bearer," the other as "man-bearer." In order to mediate between them, Nestorius suggested the expression "Christ-bearer"; but in a sermon preached at Constantinople, on one of the festivals of the Virgin, by Proclus, Bishop of Cyzicus, he, in the presence of Nestorius, made use of the opportunity to describe the honour and dignity of Mary as God-bearer, and to defend the expression. Nestorius con-

sidered it necessary to preach a sermon in order, as he said, to warn those who were present against an excessive veneration of Mary, and against the opinion that the Word of God (the Logos) could be born twice (once eternally from the Father, and a second time of Mary).

In other discourses he taught that in order "to make satisfaction for men, Christ assumed the person of the guilty nature (humanity). . . . Christ is not mere man, but God and man at the same time. . . . And this man I worship along with the Godhead as impregnated with Divine authority, as the instrument of the goodness of the Lord, as the living garment of the King—*separo naturas sed conjungo reverentiam*. That which was formed in the womb of Mary is not God Himself . . . but because God dwells in Him Whom He has assumed, therefore, He Who is assumed is called God because of Him Who assumes Him. And it is not God Who has suffered, but God united with the crucified flesh. We will, therefore, call the holy Virgin *θεοδόχος*, but not *θεοτόκος*, for only God the Father is *θεοτόκος*; but we will honour that nature which is the garment of God along with Him Who makes use of this garment; we will separate the natures and unite the honour, we will acknowledge a double nature and worship it as one."

We can see from this that Nestorius determined to hold fast to the duality of the natures and the integrity of each ; but that he persistently opposed the assumption that the term θεοτόκος could be applied to Mary, and in this was certainly heretical. Nestorius, instead of uniting the human *nature* with the Divine person, always assumes the union of a human *person* with the Godhead.

Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, by letter remonstrated very seriously with Nestorius; he reminded him that even the great Athanasius has used the expression God-bearer. He urged that as the body and soul of the child are born at the same time of a woman—although, properly, the soul *in itself* cannot be born—so also the Divine Logos was born along with the human nature; that the body of Christ is not the body of any other, but of the Word, *i.e.*, the human nature does not belong to any human *person*, but the personality to which it belongs is the Logos. Were the humanity of Christ a mere instrument of the Godhead, then Christ would not be essentially different from Moses, for he too was an instrument of God.

Nestorius replied acrimoniously, and appealed to Rome; and Cyril also laid the matter before the Pope. In his letter to Pope Celestine, A.D. 430, he says “it would be more agreeable if we

could keep silence ; but God demands of us watchfulness, and ecclesiastical custom requires me to inform your Holiness."

The Pope held a Synod at Rome, at which Nestorius was declared a heretic, and threatened with deposition, unless he revoked his errors within ten days of the reception of this decision.

Nestorius expressed himself as willing to acknowledge that the word *θεοτόκος* had also an orthodox meaning, but gave no promise respecting that expression. Cyril, at a Synod held by him at Alexandria, caused a formula of belief to be drawn up, which Nestorius should be required to accept. At this Synod twelve anathematisms were composed, with which Nestorius was required to agree. Nestorius gave no answer, but drew up twelve counter anathematisms.

The conflict was thus continued, and as not long after the outbreak of the Nestorian controversy an Ecumenical Council for its settlement had been demanded both by the orthodox and the Nestorians, the Emperor Theodosius II. had on the 19th of November, 430—and thus a few days before the anathematisms of Cyril arrived at Constantinople—issued a circular letter bearing also the name of his Western colleague, Valentinian III., summoning all the Metropolitans for Pentecost of the following year to an Ecumenical Synod at Ephesus. The



Pope, in a letter to Theodosius, informed him that he could not personally attend the Synod, but he nominated as his legates two bishops, Arcadius and Projectus, together with the priest Philipppus, and enjoined them to hold strictly by Cyril, and at the same time to preserve the dignity of the Apostolic See. They were to be present at the transactions of the Synod, and give effect to that which the Pope had long ago decided with respect to Nestorius.

The Pope and neither of the Emperors were able to appear personally ; but they appointed Count Candidian (captain of the Imperial body-guard) as the protector of the Council. A second Imperial Count (Irenæus) was also to attend at Ephesus, but only to accompany his friend, Bishop Nestorius.

Nestorius, with his sixteen bishops, was among the first to arrive at Ephesus. As if he was going to battle, he was accompanied by a large number of men in armour. Soon afterwards, four or five days before Pentecost, Cyril arrived, with fifty bishops. Some days after Pentecost, Juvenal of Jerusalem and Flavian of Mesopotamia appeared, with their bishops ; and Archbishop Memnon of Ephesus, too, had assembled around him forty of his suffragans and twelve bishops from Pamphylia. While waiting the arrival of others, preliminary

conversations were held on the point in question, during which Cyril endeavoured to gain friends for the true doctrine. It was then that Nestorius broke out with the exclamation : “ Never will I call a child of two or three months old God ; and I will have no more communication with you.” By these words he clearly showed the nature of his heresy. There was still absent one of the superior Metropolitans (patriarchs), John of Antioch ; and, from the various pretexts upon which he delayed his arrival, it was thought that he did not wish to be present at the condemnation of his former priest and friend, Nestorius. Cyril, who—as is expressly stated in the acts—also represented the Pope, now, therefore, decided on opening the Synod (June 22nd, 431) in the Cathedral of Ephesus. Several bishops waited upon Nestorius and invited him to attend the session. At first he replied, “ I will consider it ” ; but a second deputation being sent to him, he replied that he would attend when all the bishops were assembled. The Synod for a third time sent bishops to him ; but these received no answer, and were treated with insolence by the soldiers on guard in and around the house.

Candidian appeared at the Synod, and demanded a further delay of four days ; but Bishop Memnon pointed out that sixteen days had already elapsed beyond the limit appointed for the opening ; and,

as Nestorius declined to appear, they proceeded to an examination of the point of doctrine in question.

The letter of Cyril to Nestorius, before referred to, was then read, in which he had explained the hypostatic union of the Godhead and manhood in Christ. To the question of Cyril, whether this letter of his agreed with the contents of the Nicene Creed, all the bishops present (at that time one hundred and sixty) answered in a manner entirely affirmative; the letter of Nestorius to Cyril in reply was then read, and after thirty-four bishops had emphatically declared its non-agreement with the Nicene Creed, all the bishops cried out together: "If any one does not anathematise Nestorius let him be himself anathema; the true Faith anathematises him, the holy Synod anathematises him."

In order to submit the doctrinal point to a thorough investigation, a number of passages from the writings of the Fathers of the Church were read. Those were the statements of Peter, Bishop of Alexandria; of Athanasius, Pope Julius I., Pope Felix I.; Theophilus, Archbishop of Alexandria; of Cyprian, Ambrose, Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, and others. All these early authorities knew nothing of the Nestorian separation of the Godhead and manhood; but, on

the contrary, taught the true incarnation of the Logos.

All the speeches made at the Synod have not come down to us ; but the condemnation of Nestorius was pronounced in the following words :

“ As, in addition to other things, the impious Nestorius has not obeyed our citation, and did not receive the holy bishops who were sent by us to him, we were compelled to examine his ungodly doctrines. We discovered that he held and published impious doctrines in his letters and treatises, as well as in discourses which he delivered in this city, and which have been testified to.

“ Urged by the canons, and in accordance with the letter of our most Holy Father and fellow-servant Celestine, the Roman bishop, we have come with many tears to this sorrowful sentence against him ; namely, that our Lord Jesus Christ, Whom he has blasphemed, decrees by the holy Synod that Nestorius be excluded from the episcopal dignity, and from all priestly communion.”

The sentence was received with great joy by the population of Ephesus, and the city was illuminated in many places. Candidian, however, caused the placards by which the sentence against Nestorius had been published to be torn down, and at the same time published an edict, in which

he declared that, a part having been done before the arrival of John of Antioch, as well as of the Latin bishops, the Synod was invalid.

Nestorius too raised complaints; and a letter was addressed to the Emperor, setting forth that the Egyptians and Asiatics had, of their own free will, held a session, and had thus gone against the Imperial command; they requested that the bishops might be allowed to return home, and that a genuine Synod might be held, at which two learned bishops from each province, together with the metropolitan, would be sufficient. Nestorius and ten other bishops signed this document.

The Synod reported the whole proceedings to Pope Celestine, who had already pronounced the same judgment as the Synod upon Nestorius; they also entreated the Emperor to take care that heresy should be eradicated from all the Churches, and the books of Nestorius burnt.

A few days afterwards John, Patriarch of Antioch, arrived, and the Synod sent to him a deputation of bishops, to show him proper respect; but they were received with blows from the soldiers, who under Irenæus had been constituted Nestorius' body-guard. At the same time John of Antioch held what he was pleased to call a holy Synod at his own residence; and this assembly, consisting of only forty-three members, while on the

other side were more than two hundred, was to decide what was proper. Many false accusations were made against Cyril and Memnon, and the holy Synod, as it styled itself, deposed Cyril and Memnon, and excommunicated the others. The Emperor Theodosius, on being apprised of the events at Ephesus, and being greatly influenced by Candidian's report, sent the Magistrian Palladius to Ephesus, with a letter setting forth that he had learned from Candidian that a part of the bishops had held a session without waiting for John of Antioch, and that not all the bishops had taken part in this session; and he ordered that until the dogma had been discussed by the collective Synod no bishop was to leave the city of Ephesus.

A second session was held at the episcopal residence of Memnon. The number present was the same as the first session. The occasion for this second session was, however, given by the arrival of the Papal legates, Acadius and Projectus, and the presbyter Philip, who had to deliver the letter of the Pope, which pronounced in energetic language a commendation on the Synod. At the close of the letter the Pope said that he had sent three deputies to carry out what he had already decided in reference to Nestorius, and that he did not doubt that the assembled bishops



would agree therewith. The letter from the Pope was received with great rejoicing ; and Projectus urged that in this matter, according to the Pope's opinion, the Synod had no longer to examine whether Nestorius taught error ; and that it was only incumbent upon the Synod to confirm this by their accession. The Papal legates asked that the decisions of the Synod already adopted should be laid before them, so that they might adopt them ; they at the same time thanked the holy members that they had adhered to their holy head, knowing well that Peter was the head of the Catholic faith and of all the Apostles.

At the third session the legates declared that they had read the acts of the first session, and had found the judgment to be quite canonical, and they then pronounced excommunication and deposition against Nestorius. All the bishops present then subscribed a Synodal Letter addressed to the Emperor, in which it was related how even before the opening of the Ephesine Synod, the Westerns had held a council of their own in Rome, and had there rejected the doctrine of Nestorius. Pope Celestine had already communicated this in a letter, and now his legates had confirmed the sentence of Ephesus on Nestorius. Thus the whole of Christendom, with the exception of a few friends of Nestorius, had pronounced a





unanimous judgment, and consequently the Emperor should decree that a new bishop should be given to the Church of Constantinople.

At the fourth session the Patriarch John of Antioch was cited; but the bishops were received by armed men, and not admitted to John's presence. A second deputation was treated in the same manner. At the fifth session John was cited for a third time, but he did not appear; thereupon the Synod declared that they had reason to proceed in the most stringent manner against John and his companions, but that they preferred gentleness, and would not depose but only excommunicate them, and suspend them from all spiritual jurisdiction until they confessed their offences.

The account of the proceedings was sent to the Emperor, and Nestorius at the same time appealed to him. The Emperor confirmed the deposition by the Synod of Nestorius, but he also confirmed the deposition of Cyril and Memnon. He at the same time sent one of the highest officers of State to Ephesus, to publish the sentence and to effect a union of the separated bishops. It was not surprising that the Emperor should have pronounced a sentence of deposition on Cyril, as he was destitute of all necessary insight into the whole theological question, and after the cunning

manner of diplomatists, the true state of the matter was ignored, that is, the actual existence of opposing Synods at Ephesus.

Both Cyril and the Nestorians appealed to the Emperor, who eventually summoned before him eight representatives of each of the two parties. On the Catholic side was the Roman priest and Papal legate, Philip, and the Bishop Arcadius, also a Papal legate and six bishops. Cyril being in prison could not go. On the other side were John of Antioch, John of Damascus, and six other bishops. In the mandate which the orthodox Synods delivered to their deputies, they were ordered "not to consent to communion with John of Antioch and his apostate council, because they have refused, in common with us, to depose Nestorius, and because to this day they defend his doctrines, and have not shrunk from slandering the Synod of the whole world as heretical. If, however, the Emperor urgently requires it (for we must always obey him when possible) you shall grant the Antiochenes communion, on the condition that they subscribe to the deposition of Nestorius, ask forgiveness of the Synod in writing, with reference to Cyril and Memnon principally, anathematise the heresies of Nestorius, and take common action with the Synod for the restitution of Cyril and Memnon." The Anti-

ochenes were advised to stipulate for the rectification of the proceedings of their assembly, and assured that this would satisfy everything, if only the heretical propositions of Cyril were rejected.

The deputies were subsequently directed by the Emperor to meet at Chalcedon instead of at Constantinople. Five sessions were held at Chalcedon in the presence of the Emperor ; but no records of the details have been preserved.

The Emperor, despairing of the possibility of a compromise, suddenly returned to Constantinople, without the deputies of the Antiochenes venturing to follow him ; whilst he ordered those of the orthodox party to come after him, and to ordain another Bishop of Constantinople in the place of the deposed Nestorius.

The Antiochenes were greatly troubled at this, and wrote violently to the Emperor, attacking Cyril. The Emperor answered by a short decree addressed to the whole Synod of Ephesus, that is, to both parties in common, in which he laments that discord still exists, and commands all the members of the Synod to return home from Ephesus, and again to fill their Episcopal Sees. Only Cyril and Memnon are to remain deposed.

The Antiochene deputies had not expected such a result, and again addressed the Emperor, in which they stated that if the Emperor, in spite of their

adjuration, would not receive the true Faith, then they shook the dust off their feet, crying, with Paul, "We are guiltless of your blood." This was not more effective than their previous efforts ; on the contrary, the Emperor now placed himself more decidedly on the side of the orthodox : and after these had, in accordance with his command, ordained a new Bishop of Constantinople in the person of Maximin, he issued a new decree to the orthodox Synod only, from which it appears that he was not well satisfied with the party in refusing to join in discussion with the Antiochenes, but, nevertheless, restores Cyril and Memnon, and commands the bishops to return to their churches, whereby the Synod was dissolved.

The doctrinal question had practically been decided anterior to the sessions of the Council of Ephesus, Pope Celestine having already, at the Synod of Rome, declared Nestorius a heretic, and threatened deposition unless he revoked his errors within ten days ; and subsequently instructed his legates to give effect to that which he had long ago decided with respect to Nestorius. The prolongation of the discussion was, no doubt, owing to the urgent wish of the Emperor Theodosius, following the course adopted by Constantine, to, if possible, attain a cessation of strife, and preserve unity in the Church. Pope Celestine died in 432,

and was succeeded by Sixtus III., and Sixtus and the Emperor in that year again attempt mediation. Cyril did everything in his power to obtain a victory for the orthodox cause ; emissaries were more than once sent to Antioch, and a better feeling eventually prevailed. The Patriarch John, together with his bishops assembled round him, addressed friendly letters to Cyril, to Pope Sixtus, and to Bishop Maximin of Constantinople, which are still extant, and are interesting evidences of the restored unity ; the most important of them directed to these persons states that when they arrived at Ephesus “they had found the matter had already been settled, and were dissatisfied therewith ; and we returned to our churches and cities without having subscribed the sentence of the holy Synod on Nestorius. As, however, all must really have had in view to seek restoration of union . . . we also determined to agree to the judgment pronounced against Nestorius, to recognise him as deposed, and to anathematise his infamous doctrine, since our Church, like your Holiness, has always had the true doctrine, and will ever preserve it and transmit it to the nations.” Although some difficulties with certain bishops had still to be overcome, peace and union were eventually universally re-established.

## CHAPTER VII.

THE Council of Ephesus was dissolved in 431, and it was not until 451 that the Fourth Ecumenical Council was summoned at Nicœa (the place of assembly was afterwards changed to Chalcedon). In the intermediate period Gallican Synods were held at Arles, Orange, and at Vaison, 441—443, at which the Metropolitan presided, when many decisions relating to discipline and morals were promulgated. Amongst other matters it was decided by the 5th Canon of the Synod at Orange that "If any one has taken refuge in a church, he shall not be given up, but shall be sheltered from respect to the sacred place."

Various Synods were held 444—448 at Rome, Oriental Synods at Ephesus and Antioch, and in Spain and Britain. In the last-mentioned year a more important Synod was held at Constantinople in consequence of Eutyches, Abbot of an important monastery, who had zealously opposed the heresy of Nestorius, having blindly fallen into another, equally repugnant to truth. Nestorius had asserted two personalities in Jesus

Christ. Eutyches erred in confounding the two natures, and—in admitting only one after the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ—maintained that His human nature was totally absorbed by the Divine and became one with it ; from which it would have followed that Christ had no real body, and consequently, that as the Divine nature was incapable of pain, He neither died or suffered in reality, but in appearance only.

The Synod which was presided over by the Patriarch Flavian condemned and deposed Eutyches.

Eutyches, however, had powerful friends at Court, and the Emperor Theodosius II. was induced to summon an Ecumenical Council at Ephesus—known as the Robber Synod. About one hundred and thirty bishops assembled at Ephesus, 449. The Pope, who was unable to be present, sent legates : he at the same time addressed letters to Flavian, in which he defines at great length the true Faith ; also letters to the Emperor and his sister, Pulcheria.

The discussions were conducted with violence and injustice, and the assembly is commonly called the *Latrocinium*, or Ephesian conventicle of robbers. Under the terror of armed soldiery, introduced by two Imperial commissaries, Eutyches was pronounced orthodox and Flavian condemned.



The holy Patriarch appealed to Pope Leo ; but that appeal did not prevent his being imprisoned and then banished to Lydia, where very shortly after he died, in consequence of the treatment to which he was subjected. The Emperor Theodosius was made to rectify by public edict the whole of the proceedings of the Synod ; but the Pope, on being informed of what had taken place, annulled all that had been done.

Pope Leo was anxious to restore ecclesiastical unity without a new council, and wrote letters to this effect to Marcian, who (by his marriage with Pulcheria, sister of the late Emperor Theodosius, who had died) had become Emperor. Marcian, who, with Pulcheria, was strongly attached to the true Faith, had already, on May 17th, 451, summoned an Ecumenical Council at Nicœa, which place of assembly was afterwards, as before stated, changed to Chalcedon, because of its proximity to Constantinople, and the difficulty with which the Emperor could at that time be spared from the capital.

The Pope was unable to attend, but he assented to the convocation of the Council, and nominated legates, whom he instructed not to allow any opposition to the true Faith.

Three hundred and sixty bishops attended ; and on Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, who had

presided at the Robber Synod, taking his seat, the Pope's legates declared that "they had a command from the Apostolic Bishop of Rome, who is head of all Churches, that Dioscorus should have no seat in the assembly," and demanded that this matter should be first considered ; which resulted in Dioscorus being ordered to leave his place and to sit in the middle (so that he had to leave the ranks of those entitled to vote), and by this means the Papal legates were pacified.

The Pope had already decided the doctrinal question : that is to say, the oneness of the person, and the distinction of two natures in Jesus Christ ; and by his exhaustive doctrinal letter to Flavian left no room for discussion. But the letter had been suppressed by Dioscorus at the Robber Synod of Ephesus, and as the decisions of the cabal at Ephesus, sanctioned on the one hand by the late Emperor Theodosius, and condemned on the other by the Pope, had caused great excitement, and the errors of Eutyches had obtained much support in Egypt, it was considered desirable, in order that unity should be preserved in the Church, that the Pope's decision should be affirmed at a General Council.

Several sessions were held, and from the documents read and speeches made no doubt was left as to the coercion, even by physical force, which had

been used at the Robber Synod ; and on the celebrated letter of Leo to Flavian, above referred to, being read in a Greek translation, the bishops exclaimed : " That is the faith of the fathers, that is the faith of the Apostles ! We all believe this ; anathema to him who believes otherwise ! Peter has spoken by Leo ! That is the true Faith."

Expressive of this belief, they approved and signed a formulary, in which they affirmed by decree that to be orthodox " we must confess one only, Jesus Christ, Our Lord, true God and true man, consubstantial with the Father according to His Divinity, and consubstantial with man according to His humanity ; so that He perfectly possesses two natures : the one Divine, which He has had from all eternity ; the other human, which He received in the womb of Mary, His Virgin mother ; both united in one and the self-same Person, which is the second Person of the Most Blessed Trinity ; that, following the holy Fathers, we all teach, with one accord, one and the same Son, Our Lord Jesus Christ, perfect in His Godhead and perfect in His manhood, true God and true man, consisting of a reasonable soul and of a body, of one substance with the Father as touching the Godhead, and of one substance with us as touching the manhood ; like unto us in everything, sin excepted ; according to the Godhead begotten of the Father before all

time ; but in the last days, for us men and for our salvation, according to the manhood, born of the Virgin Mary, the God-bearer, one and the same Christ, Son, Lord ; only-begotten, confessed in two natures, without confusion, without change, without rending or separation ; while the difference of the natures is in no way denied by reason of the union ; on the other hand, the peculiarity of each nature is preserved, and both concur in one Person and hypostasis."

This definition left nothing to be desired in clearness, and no room for the reassertion of the heresy of Eutyches. No confusion could henceforth be pleaded. Christ's two natures—the one Divine, which he had from all eternity ; the other human, which he received in the womb of Mary—both united in one and the self-same.

This Council afterwards discussed the cases of the bishops who had been deposed at the Robber Synod, and reinstated those who had been improperly deprived of their Sees.

Twenty-eight canons were drawn up at this Council ; many of them relate to ecclesiastical discipline : but the Imperial commissioners and Papal legates had left at the close of the fourteenth session of the Council, and in their absence the other members of the Council held a new discussion, which is reckoned as the fifteenth session,

and drew up the 28th Canon. This canon sets forth the privileges conceded to the See of Old Rome, on account of its character as an Imperial city ; and for the same reason attempted to raise the Bishop of Constantinople, which city under Constantine the Great had received the title of New Rome, to an equality with the Bishop of Rome. This canon gave occasion for the holding of a new session—the sixteenth—at which the Papal legates declared that “ the Apostolic See had ordered that everything shall be discussed in our presence,” and prayed that everything done on the previous day be annulled. “ If not, that our protest be entered in the minutes, so that we may know what we have to inform the Apostolic Bishop who presides over the whole Church, so that he may take some resolution upon the wrong done to his own See, or upon the violation of the canons.”

These words were entered on the minutes, and the commissioners closed the business with the words “ that the prerogative of the Church of Constantinople is, in spite of the opposition of the Roman legates, decreed by the Synod.”

A Synodal Letter was written to the Pope, asking him to confirm the decrees in which allusion is made to Dioscorus and his armed followers, particularly of his having attacked even him who was by

the Saviour of mankind appointed keeper of the Divine vineyard (the Pope), and having dared to excommunicate him whose office was to unite the body of the Church.

The prerogatives conferred upon the See of Constantinople are then referred to, and the Pope is prayed to honour their decree with his assent.

Later letters were addressed to the Pope by the Emperor Marcian and the Archbishop of Constantinople, in which they express their hope that the Pope will give his assent to the decree in reference to the See of Constantinople. The Archbishop, in his letter, while he supports the claims of Constantinople, states that there is no doubt that His Holiness and his Church possessed higher precedence, and that the protest of his legates had been made in consequence of their not rightly understanding the Pope's intention.

The Pope, in reply to the Emperor, expressed his joy at the happy termination of the Synod, but refused his assent to the 28th Canon, and prayed the Emperor not to confirm the unrighteous attempts of Anatolius, the Archbishop of Constantinople, which are dangerous to Christian unity and peace.

To Anatolius he wrote with great severity, and reprimanded him for having abused, for ends of his own ambition, the holy Synod.

The Emperor, in three decrees, confirmed the



doctrinal decrees of Chalcedon, and urged the Pope not to delay in publishing his confirmation of the Synod of Chalcedon ; and Leo addressed to all the bishops who had been present at the Synod a letter, dated March 21st, 453, in which he confirms the doctrinal decree of the Synod, but at the same time admonishes them that the rights of individual churches must remain unaltered. For a long time no further appeal was made by the Greeks to the 28th Canon, and it was even omitted from their collections. The Eutychian or Monophysite heresy, however, still continued rife in Palestine and Egypt, and several branch communities extended into various provinces of Western and Central Asia, but without possessing any considerable importance. It was not until the sixth century (553) that, by the decision of the Fifth General Council, held at Constantinople, this subject of long and acrimonious dispute happily terminated, and internal harmony was restored to the Church ; nevertheless, the heresy was at a later period revived under a new dress. Sergius, a Syrian, born of Eutychian parents, asserted that Jesus Christ had but one will and one operation, thus reviving Monotheism ; and this heresy eventually resulted in a Sixth General Council held at Trullo in the year 680, presided over by three legates of Pope St. Agatho, who then sat in



St. Peter's Chair. The Council was prolonged for no less than ten months, during which sixteen sessions were held. It condemned the Monothelites.

A second Council was held at Trullo in the year 692. This Council was, at the instigation of Paul the Monothelite, Patriarch of Constantinople, called by Justinian II., and two hundred and eleven bishops obeyed the Imperial command.

One of the most important features in the discipline of the Catholic Church is the celibacy of the clergy. The institution is in harmony with the spirit of the Gospel, and during the first seven centuries was enforced both in the East and West. "What the Apostles taught," says the Second Council of Carthage, "and what antiquity observed, let us keep."

A profession of the purest chastity, according to the Apostolic rule, was a requisite qualification for receiving Holy Orders. If a married man was chosen for the priesthood it was with the obligation of living separate from his wife. Wherever we find in history allusion made to the children of an exemplary bishop or priest, it is always to be understood of children born before he entered into Holy Orders, as Gibbon has pointed out in his "History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire."

A departure from this primitive practice was devised and adopted by the degenerate Greeks, and the real design of the convocation of this Council was to introduce a new system of ecclesiastical discipline in mitigation of the former one ; but the pretended reason was to frame canons as a supplement to previous Councils, and it enacted one hundred and two canons, forming a composition of old and new rules of discipline. It confirms the ancient law which forbids bishops to cohabit with their wives, and the clergy to marry after ordination ; but it permits priests, deacons, and sub-deacons to continue with the wives they had taken before ordination.

Justinian's ambition was that this conventicle should be admitted as an Ecumenical Council, and thus to impose his canons upon the whole Church ; but, although master of Rome, he could not obtain the approbation of the Pope (St. Sergius), and the canons of Trullo never received the sanction of the Holy See, nor was the Catholic purity of the Western discipline ever sullied by the carnal innovations of Constantinople.

This brings us to the end of the seventh century.

## CHAPTER VIII.

I HAVE hitherto confined myself to relating, in order of succession, up to the close of the seventh century, the history of the Church from a theological point of view. The reader can easily appreciate the difficulties which had to be overcome in order to suppress heresy and secure unity in the Church. But it must be borne in mind that Christ said to His Apostles: "If the world hate you, know ye that it hath hated Me before you; if they have persecuted Me they will also persecute you"; and that the Church, besides preserving its purity, had to fight the battle of Christianity against the civil power. It is here, therefore, expedient to advert to the persecutions to which Christians were subjected from the earliest periods.

*First Century.*—The Emperor Nero was the first who ordered systematic persecution. For the first five years of his reign he was, under the guidance of Seneca, a just and clement Sovereign; but subsequently, yielding to the influence of the flattery of his courtiers, he became a monster of cruelty. He poisoned his father-in-law; put to

death his mother and his wife, Octavia ; and with a kick killed his second wife, who was pregnant at the time. He wished that the whole human race had but one head, that he might have the pleasure of cutting it off at one stroke. His palace became a sink of iniquity and degradation ; and his courtiers vied with one another in all excesses of vice and cruelty, in order to ingratiate themselves with their Sovereign. His brutality culminated in his setting fire to Rome, in order that he might satisfy his vanity by rebuilding it on a more magnificent scale, and giving it his own name. In order to assuage the resentment of the populace, he accused the Christians of being the authors of the conflagration, and commenced a persecution of unparalleled cruelty. Christians were wrapped in skins of wild beasts and worried by dogs ; steeped in pitch, placed at certain distances, and then set on fire, to illuminate the streets by night. Among the numerous victims of Nero's persecution were St. Peter and St. Paul. St. Peter was crucified head downwards ; St. Paul, being a Roman citizen, had the privilege of dying by the sword. Nero closed the horrors of his reign by putting an end to his own life in the year 68.

Nero was succeeded in rapid succession by Galba, Otho, Vitellius, and Vespasian. Vespasian was of a humane disposition. The destruction

of Jerusalem by his son, Titus, is the most remarkable event of his reign. The Jews had made several attempts to shake off the yoke of the Roman Emperors, and at length openly revolted. The Christians of Jerusalem, remembering the prediction of Christ, foresaw the destruction of the city, and fled to Pella, a town in the mountains of Syria ; Jerusalem, as we know, was rebellious to the end, and within four months, during which the siege lasted, upwards of a million Jews (men, women, and children) perished by hunger and the sword.

Titus, who succeeded Vespasian, was even more humane than his father. He reigned for a short time only, and was succeeded by his brother, Domitian, who possessed all the vices of Nero, and hated the Christians. He was relentless in his persecution, with the desire of accomplishing the total destruction of the Church.

Among the many who suffered martyrdom was Flavius Clemens, the Consul. St. John the Evangelist was by Domitian's orders cast into a caldron of boiling oil ; but, as testified by Tertullian, he came out unhurt. He subsequently died a natural death at Ephesus, about the close of the first century.

*Second Century.*—The persecution of the Christians was at times intermittent. Under Nerva, who

succeeded Domitian, the Church suffered no persecution ; but his reign was short. We also find that some of the Pagan governors were not only humane, but just in their reports on the Christians. Pliny the younger, Governor of Bithynia, after the persecutions had been renewed under orders from Trajan, who succeeded Nerva, in asking instructions in what manner he should proceed with respect to the Christians, in whom he declares no crime could be found, states that they are just and honest, faithful to their promise, and worthy of the trust reposed in them. Theft and adultery are proscribed by them, and except for their form of worship they are wholly blameless.

St. Clement, Bishop of Rome, and St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, were among the first to suffer under Trajan. The latter obtained the admiration of both the Christians and Pagans for the spirit in which he met his fate. So far from seeking to save himself, he expresses joy at being chosen as an acceptable sacrifice to God. He writes from Smyrna, where he was landed on his way to Rome, at which place the sentence of Trajan ("to be devoured by wild beasts for the amusement of the people") was to be carried out : "The hope of possessing God my Saviour solely engages my whole attention : let flames reduce my body to ashes ; let me expire by slow degrees



upon a cross ; let lions and tigers grind my bones and tear me limb from limb ; I shall suffer with all joy, trusting in the grace of my Redeemer, Christ." His approaching fate did not distract him in his zeal for the purity of the Faith. In his epistle to the Smyrnæans he refutes the error of the impious Docetæ, who denied Christ to have assumed real flesh, and for this reason abstained from the Eucharist. He says : "Because they do not confess the Eucharist to be the flesh of Our Saviour Jesus Christ, Who was crucified and rose again." By this epistle we have distinct evidence of the primitive doctrine of Christ's real presence, afforded by Ignatius, who was a disciple of St. John, the Apostle and Evangelist.

The persecution of the Christians by Trajan was relaxed at the close of his reign, but renewed by his successor, Adrian. These successive inhuman persecutions, however, brought multitudes into the Church. Pagans, astonished at the constancy and invincible fortitude of the Christians, flocked in crowds from every quarter to embrace the Christian faith.

The persecutions were continued under the celebrated philosopher and Emperor, Marcus Aurelius ; but were carried on owing rather to the existing laws than from any sympathy with them on the part of the Emperor, who subsequently issued an



edict forbidding that henceforth the Christians should be molested.

This decree was, it is related, issued in consequence of the prayers of the Christians in his army having in a great emergency, after the prayers ordered by the Emperor to the Pagan gods had remained unanswered, secured safety for the army engaged in a war in Germany.

The favourable decree of Aurelius gave encouragement to the Christians, and in Gaul their number greatly increased ; but, as had happened in other parts of the Roman Empire, Pagan malice again asserted itself, and fresh persecutions were inflicted. They first commenced at Lyons, and were afterwards extended to other parts of Gaul. Aurelius can hardly be held responsible for these persecutions, as the edicts of Nero and Domitian had not been recalled, and the governors of provinces readily acceded to popular clamour. Persecution was, however, still carried on in Rome, where Pope Anicetus and his successor, Soter, suffered : and for these persecutions Aurelius must be held responsible ; for, if he did not sanction he did not prevent them.

Marcus Aurelius died in 180, and was succeeded by his son, Commodus, who was devoted to pleasure and too much absorbed in his youthful frolics to care for persecutions ; and to this is owing that the

Christian faith made great progress in the islands of Great Britain. That kingdom had long since been conquered by Rome and reduced to a tributary province of the Roman Empire, retaining, nevertheless, its ancient laws under the protection of Rome.

Pius I. had sent missionaries to Great Britain ; but it was not until subsequently that Lucius, who reigned in Great Britain, and had imbibed a very favourable opinion of the Christians, embraced Christianity, and sent envoys (Eleanus and Meduanus, two Britons) to Pope Eleutherius, entreating that he and his subjects might be instructed in the Christian religion. The Pope instructed two Roman priests (Fugatius and Damianus) to accompany the British envoys to Britain. They found the King and Queen piously disposed, and they were both baptised in the year 183. Great Britain had thus the honour of being governed by the first Christian King.

*Third Century.*—For twenty years after the death of Marcus Aurelius, which occurred in 180, the Church enjoyed freedom, but persecution was revived under the Emperor Severus, and it was during his reign that Potamiana, a beautiful female slave, suffered prolonged martyrdom. She was let down slowly into a bath of boiling pitch, after refusing to purchase her life at the expense of her chastity.

Persecution of the Christians was carried on with more or less severity during this century according to the character and disposition of the Emperors.

For instance, the Church enjoyed the free exercise of religion during the two reigns of Gordianus and Philip, but on the accession of Decius persecution was renewed, and among the sufferers during his reign was the learned Origen, who was thrown into prison, but found means of escape. Under Gallus, who murdered and succeeded Decius, persecution at first ceased ; but a pestilence having arisen and spread through the empire, furnished an excuse for renewing the persecution, and Pope Cornelius and his successor, Lucius, were sacrificed to appease the wrath of fictitious deities. Similarly persecution ceased on the accession of the Emperor Valerian ; but subsequently, in order to propitiate the gods in an expedition against the Persians, he ordered the extirpation of the Christians, and among the first to suffer were St. Stephen at Rome and St. Cyprian at Carthage. Sixtus II., who was raised to the Pontificate after the martyrdom of St. Stephen, was shortly afterwards beheaded, and his Archdeacon, Laurence, who insisted upon following Sixtus to his doom, was three days afterwards subjected to a lingering death by broiling on a gridiron. Valerian was

subsequently taken prisoner by Saporess, the Persian Monarch, in whom we may recognise the avenger of St. Laurence, as after treating him as a slave for a period of ten years, he at last ordered him to be flayed alive and rubbed over with salt.

*Fourth Century.*—It was not until some twenty years had expired that persecution of the Christians to any great extent recommenced, when it was again resorted to with increased violence by the Emperor Diocletian, who shared his power with Maximian. In consequence of the extent of the empire and difficulties of government at a distance, Diocletian and Maximian judged it expedient to associate to themselves two other colleagues of an inferior rank with the title of Cæsar. Diocletian chose Galerius, Maximian Constantius Chlorus, whom Aurelius had employed in Great Britain, where he married Helen, the daughter of Coel, one of the leading men of that country, and by her was the father of the renowned Constantine, born at Colchester. Galerius, who was violent and unscrupulous, caused Diocletian and Maximian to abdicate, and, jealous of the popularity of Constantine, who had succeeded his father, Constantius, endeavoured to constitute himself absolute master of the empire. On the death of Galerius, Maxentius, son of Maximian, declared himself a

competitor for the crown, and allied himself with Maximin, the savage tyrant of Egypt who had assumed the title of Emperor. This Asiatic alliance increased the presumption of Maxentius, who now fancied himself sufficiently strong to subdue the West, and he, consequently, declared war against Constantine. Constantine immediately hastened the march of his army from Gaul, and advanced within two miles of Rome. It was during this march that it is recorded that a luminous cross appeared in the open sky with the words, in Greek, *εν τομτω νικα* (in this be thou conqueror). It is stated that this wonderful phenomenon was distinctly seen by the whole army. It inspired Constantine and his soldiers with confidence in victory. The battle was long and obstinate; but Maxentius at last gave way, and, in his endeavours to escape, fell into the Tiber and was drowned.

This memorable victory, gained on the 27th of October, 312, put Constantine in possession of the West; and its importance may be gauged from the fact that the whole of the empire soon became subject to the beneficent sway of Constantine the Great, and that the future triumph of religion was thereby secured. Rome, which had for ages been the receptacle of every heathenish superstition, now became, under the protection of Constantine, the

centre of the one holy Catholic and Apostolic religion.

The reference made to the persecution of the Christians in this history has been, perhaps, unduly minimised; the extent of the persecutions may, however, be easily brought home to us by the fact that the Christians could only escape extermination by concealing themselves and living in the Catacombs.

Much has been said in condemnation of the persecuting Emperors; and the cruelty which they exercised, no doubt, calls for severe animadversion. Nevertheless, it is the constancy with which the Martyrs suffered that Christians should remember, rather than display anger in condemnation of the Emperors. We must bear in mind the political situation: the Emperors were custodians of the existing institutions of the period, and it was expected of them that they would uphold the religion of their time, which was held in veneration by the people. Moreover, a religion based upon superstition was necessarily a prolific source of persecution. When the Roman arms met with disaster, or when sickness seized upon the people in epidemic form, it was assumed that the gods were offended; and it was but natural that the Christians who refused to do homage to the Pagan gods should be credited with exciting their anger.



Hence we often find that those Emperors who passed their time in amusement were the least persecuting Emperors, and that those Emperors who took an interest in the affairs of the State, upheld the religion of the people from motives of policy, if for no other reason. Even the learned and philosophic Emperor, Marcus Aurelius, to whom the Pagan religion and persecution were evidently repugnant, seems to have considered it expedient to permit persecution in the outlying provinces, and, indeed, to a certain extent, in Rome, or was powerless to prevent it.

Moreover, while condemning the cruelty of Imperial Rome we should bear in mind that in later times, more particularly in Spain, heresy was punished by death. No doubt that while this state of things existed the whole nation was Catholic, and heresy was looked upon as blasphemy, for which, even in our time, punishment has been inflicted in England by the law. In those days, in Spain, the one visible and infallible Church represented the Faith of the nation, and heresy was looked upon in the same light as a foul disease which it was right to stamp out.

If we cannot approve the Roman or Spanish persecutions, we can, in a measure, account for them. In the former case, the Christians were not altogether unnaturally held to be responsible for



the disasters which from time to time befell the empire, because they were supposed to have offended the gods, who could only be propitiated by vengeance being taken upon those who refused their homage; in the latter, heresy was *contra mores*. The Catholic faith was not only predominant, but may be said to have dominated the individual in his private life and the nation in its political policy. Heresy was, therefore, regarded as an unpardonable offence to the individual and collective conscience. It was not a matter with which to argue or temporise, it must be extirpated. What is much more difficult to understand are the persecutions of the Protestants. There was no Protestant Church which claimed infallibility and the right to be obeyed in matters of faith. Based upon private judgment in matters spiritual, the dominating party persecuted those who differed from it. All that can be said in extenuation is that in political matters the Catholics and Protestants had different interests at heart, and that the persecution by the Protestants, although often fanatical, was in a great measure resorted to to subserve political ends. This is clearly seen in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, when the Catholics favoured Mary Stuart, the legitimate heir to the throne, and were persecuted, not because they were Catholics, but because they were considered dangerous to the reigning Sovereign.

## CHAPTER IX.

IN the earlier chapters of this history of the Church the doctrine of the Christian religion is practically demonstrated by the account given of the action of the various Councils during the first seven centuries. In the chapter immediately preceding this, in recounting the persecutions to which the Christians were subjected under the various Emperors, the general political situation has been described up to the fourth century, when the conversion of the Emperor Constantine the Great secured the triumph of Christianity.

It may, however, be of advantage here to place briefly before the reader the situation, both from a political and religious point of view, which culminated in the triumph of the Church in the fourth century.

The ancient world in its earlier ages consisted of a great number of independent communities. Situated along the shores of the Mediterranean, and extending themselves inland, they were divided into various tribes, all confined within narrow limits, but all quite free, and each pos-

sessing its own peculiar character and institutions. Their ideas of God and religion were strictly local. As the might of Rome arose all this was changed ; the self-governing communities which had previously filled the world are seen to totter one after the other and, finally, to disappear, and the subjugation of the State necessarily involved the downfall of the national religion. Forms of belief became merged in the dominant religion of the governing State, and no sooner did the various mythologies come in contact than their mutual destruction ensued. These independent communities having become blended and absorbed within the limits of the Roman Empire, there remained but one sole power that could be called self-dependent ; Religion acknowledged this when it decreed Divine worship to the Emperor.

It was at this period that Jesus Christ was born, and it is not difficult to understand the antagonism that existed between the precepts of the religion of Christ and those of the empire, and how little the former were in harmony with notions which prevailed at the time. The virtues of humility and poverty, the steadfastness of the Martyrs under suffering, were new to the Pagan world ; while the refusal of the Christians to bow down before idols, or render Divine honours to the Emperor, were looked upon as an insult to the Emperor and

the nation. It is not unnatural to suppose that communities deprived of their independence and their religion should be ready to sympathise with the Christians, and this may have been a means of assisting the propagation of the Christian religion. The world-wide authority of the Roman Emperors, on the other hand, was subsequently equally advantageous, as it enabled Theodosius the Great to issue an edict, directing that all nations subject to the empire should not depart from "that religion which the Divine Apostle Peter declares himself to have delivered to the Romans."

A complete change, however, in the political situation was imminent. The Roman Empire, so long conquering and paramount, was assailed by its neighbours, and in its turn invaded and overcome. Amidst the general convulsion that ensued, Christianity received a violent shock; but, although the empire was shattered in the western provinces, the Church remained firm and undisturbed; but found itself in entirely altered conditions. A Pagan people took possession of Britain; the Lombards established a powerful sovereignty before the very gates of Rome; the Arabs poured themselves over the West as they had previously done over the East: they gained possession of Africa, made themselves masters of Spain, their General, Musa, boasting that he would

march into Italy and cause the name of Mohammed to be proclaimed from the Vatican.

Happily, the true Faith was no longer confined within the limits of the Roman Empire. Christianity had long overpassed these limits ; more especially had it taken root among the German tribes of the West.

Among all the Germanic nations, the Franks alone had become Catholic from their first rise in the provinces of the Roman Empire ; and to this power the Pope had but to stretch forth his hands in order to obtain succour. This attachment to Catholicism was powerfully strengthened from a totally different quarter. In the sixth century, the attention of Pope Gregory the Great having been attracted to certain Anglo-Saxons who were exposed for sale in the slave market of Rome, he at once resolved that Christianity should be preached to the nation " whence these beautiful captives had been taken." Never, perhaps, was any step taken by a Pope whence results more important ensued ; together with the doctrines of Christianity, a veneration for Rome and for the Holy See, such as never before had existed in any nation, marked the Germanic Britons.

Boniface, the Apostle of the Germans, was an Anglo-Saxon, and upon all the German churches founded by him was imposed an extraordinary

obligation to obedience. The Gallican bishops who had hitherto maintained a certain independence of Rome, thenceforward received their pallium from Rome ; and thus did the devoted submission of the Anglo-Saxons extend itself over the whole realm of the Franks. This empire had now become the central point for all the German tribes of the West. Clovis, who may be said to have been the founder of the French Monarchy, was converted to Christianity by the influence of his wife, Clotilda ; and Pepin of Heristal, founder of the Carlovingian dynasty, who subsequently had risen to supreme power, was the first King who offered effectual resistance to the Mohammedan conquerors ; and when Pepin the younger, not content with the reality of the kingly power, desired also to possess himself of the name, he felt that a higher sanction was needful. This the Pope offered him. In return, the new Monarch undertook to defend "the Holy Church and the Republic of God" against the Lombards. Nor did he content himself with merely defending them ; on the contrary, he compelled the Lombards to evacuate that portion of the territory called the Exarchate, and which they had wrenched from the Roman Empire. In strict justice this territory should have been restored to the Emperor, from whom it had been taken ; but when the proposal for restoration was made to Pepin,



his reply was : "That for no favour of man had he entered the strife, but from veneration to St. Peter alone, and in the hope of obtaining forgiveness of his sins." He caused the keys of the conquered towns to be placed on the Altar of St. Peter, and in this act he laid the foundation of the whole temporal power of the Popes. What Pepin had done was confirmed by the Emperor Charlemagne ; and at length the Holy See was delivered from its long oppressive and dangerous neighbours, the Lombard chiefs.

Rome was, however, not free from contending factions, and the Pope found it necessary to obtain foreign aid ; this assistance he obtained at the hands of Charlemagne, and, impelled by gratitude, and well knowing his own need of a permanent protector, he placed the crown of the Western Empire on Charlemagne's head on Christmas Eve of the year 800. A Frank Sovereign now filled the place of the Western Emperors, and exercised all their privileges. The Pontiff, on the other hand, remained head of the Hierarchy in the Roman West, which now diffused itself over the German nations. This extension of the Hierarchy over the West was, however, accompanied by the separation of the East ; and the Popes henceforth gradually ceased to command influence there, and this has continued until our time. Of his patri-



archal diocese in the East the Greek Emperors had long since deprived him. In the East the Roman Empire was attacked by the Persian Monarch, Chosroes, who overran Mesopotamia and Syria. He plundered the cities of Antioch, Damascus, and Jerusalem; he marched into Egypt, and took possession of the wealthy city of Alexandria. Heraclius, the Governor of Africa, who had mounted the throne at Constantinople, at length roused himself, and beat back the Persian conqueror; but the Christians had not been delivered from the Persian yoke for many years when they fell under that of the Mohammedan Arabs. These Arabs had ranged themselves under the standard of Mohammed, the founder of their empire and their religion.

Mohammed was born in the year 568 at Mecca. His mother was a Jewess, his father a Pagan of noble birth, but not rich; he derived his pedigree from Ismail, the son of Abraham and Agar. Mohammed's religion is condemned by the Catholic Church, and he has been described as an impostor; but later historical inquiry and criticism has established that Mohammed was not a conscious impostor. There can be now no doubt but that in his earlier career he devoted himself to the work of religious and moral reformation, and that he cleansed Arabia from idolatry and gross immorality.

It was not till he had reached his fortieth year that he gave way to sensuality. He soon found himself at the head of a large following. The Arabs were fond of plunder, and the promise of booty to his comrades if they survived the battle, and the assurance of a place in his sensual paradise if they fell, made heroes of men naturally indolent. His first military enterprise was against Mecca, on the reduction of which city all Arabia submitted to his arms and doctrine. He then meditated an expedition against Syria, but death at the age of sixty-three, in the year 632, prevented the execution of his design. He left no issue except one daughter, who married Ali, the founder of the Mohammedan sect in Persia. Abubeker, a citizen of Mecca, succeeded him as chief of the Mussulmans. He took the title of Caliph, in other words, Vicar of the Prophet. He was succeeded by Omar, who to the title of Caliph joined that of Emir, *i.e.*, Commander of the Faithful.

Syria, Palestine, and Egypt were snatched from the Roman Empire ; the vast empire of Persia was subdued ; Jerusalem capitulated in the year 637.

From this memorable epoch, Catholicity in the Oriental provinces became most wretched : contemporaneously, the Nestorians in Syria and the Eutychians in Egypt openly avowed their erroneous doctrines. False pastors were intruded into the

Sees of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. The Emperor, Leo III., surnamed the Isaurian, founded a new sect, called the Iconoclasts, or Image-breakers, and ordered all the images of Jesus Christ, of the Virgin Mary, and the Saints to be removed from the churches ; and at Constantinople all the images and pictures were collected, carried to the market-place and there burnt : all the paintings on the church walls were effaced, so that no sacred representation might appear. The Emperor tried to enforce his edict in Rome, where his power was rather nominal than real ; but the Romans refused to obey, and Iconoclasm was subsequently formally condemned at the Seventh General Council, held at Nicœa in the eighth century. Later, in the ninth century, Photius, the Emperor Michael's secretary and Master of the Horse, by unworthy intrigues caused Ignatius, Patriarch of Constantinople, to be deposed. He received Holy Orders from Gregory, the schismatic and deposed Bishop of Syracuse, and assumed the dignity of Patriarch. Photius owed his temporary success in a measure to the weakness of Pope John VIII., whose conduct was stigmatised by the public voice as more like that of a woman than of a man ; and from this arose the fabulous story of a female Pontiff, under the appellation of Pope Joan. Photius was subse-

quently deposed, and solemnly condemned and excommunicated at the Eighth General Council, held at Constantinople : but heresies continued to be rife in the East ; the succession of bishops was broken, nor from that time downwards can it be clearly ascertained. The episcopal succession of Rome alone stands in the midst of all civil revolutions unshaken and uninterrupted from the days of St. Peter. From this era we may date the commencement of the Greek schism, which Michael Cerularius afterwards completed in the year 1053.

The loss sustained in the East was compensated by the rapid extension in the West. Charlemagne, who from the time of his coronation at Rome possessed both the Imperial crown and the Royal crown of France, exercised his great influence in support of the Pope and the Christian faith. The Church made great progress in Great Britain and the North of Europe. Greek and Latin were taught in the schools. In this century (the ninth) the Venerable Bede held the first place among men of science, and diffused light and learning, not only in England of his time, but for all time. Ina, King of Wessex, imposed an annual tribute of a penny upon every dwelling-house in his kingdom, to be paid to Rome as a public acknowledgment of his devotion and respect for the Apostolic

See, from which he and his people had received the Faith of Christ. This tribute is known as Peter pence, and was employed by the Pope in founding a school for the reception and maintenance of English students.

Bulgaria, which country had retained its position as an independent kingdom, was converted to Christianity, but adopted the Greek rite under the Patriarch of Constantinople. Russia likewise began to receive the Faith. The Russian Monarch, having concluded a treaty of peace and friendship with the Emperor of Constantinople, consented to receive a bishop from the Patriarch Ignatius for the instruction of his people in Christianity.

The decline of the Papal influence in the East did not prevent the extension to the West of Monastic institutions, which for two hundred years had flourished with so much celebrity in the East. The Monastic state may be said to be based upon the words of Christ: "If thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in Heaven; and come, follow Me." "Every one that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands for My name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall possess life everlasting" (St. Matt. xix. 21, 29).

To wean our affections from vain and empty objects, to lift the mind above all earthly pursuits, to satisfy the soul by pious habits of devotion, and to quicken the desire of loving and serving God in the most perfect manner were the ends sought to be attained by the Monastic Orders ; and if they could not follow Our Lord in His person, they endeavoured practically to carry out, not only in the spirit, but in the letter, His injunction to those who sought to attain perfection.

The Church owes much to the Monks of the East: the celebrated St. Augustine, son of Patri-  
cius, who was an idolater, and St. Monica, was born in the year 354 A.D., at Tagasta ; not at Hippo, in Africa, where he founded the celebrated Monastery from which came forth nine eminent bishops. St. Augustine was not only the oracle of his time, but the principal among all the Latin Fathers that came after him. Luther affirms that since the Apostolic time the Church had never had a better doctor than St. Augustine, and that after the sacred Scriptures there is no doctor in the Church whose teaching is to be compared to his.

The most renowned founder of Monastic discipline in the West was St. Benedict. He was born in the year 480, of noble parents, at Norcia, a town in Umbria. He was educated in the public schools at Rome.



To preserve his innocence he resolved to forsake the world ; he secretly retired to the mountains of Sublacum, forty miles from Rome. There he met a Monk of a neighbouring monastery, called Romanus, who gave him the Monastic habit, and conducted him to a narrow cave formed by nature in a rock. Here he passed three years. Accidentally discovered by some shepherds, who reported his sanctity through the country, his reputation for holiness became general. In a short time the Desert of Sublacum was filled with devout solitaries, whom he gathered into communities in twelve different houses, each of which had its own superior.

For the stability of Monastic discipline, St. Benedict composed a rule of life upon the basis of prayer, solitude, humility, and obedience. The Abbot is charged with the whole government of the monastery over which he presides ; perpetual abstinence from flesh is enjoined ; seven hours in the day are allotted for manual labour and two for pious reading, besides meditation from the end of the nocturnal office to the beginning of Lauds, about the break of day. To the labours enjoined by St. Benedict, England stands much indebted for the improvement of her waste lands.

The leading principle of St. Benedict's teaching was humility, and he laid down twelve degrees



of humility in his rule ; and as these have had a world-wide effect in later times upon the several Monastic Orders, which have all adopted the spirit of these rules, we transcribe them :

1. A deep compunction of heart and holy fear of God and His judgments, with a constant attention to walk in the Divine presence.

2. The perfect renunciation of our will.

3. Ready obedience.

4. Patience under all sufferings and injuries.

5. The manifestation of our thoughts and designs to our superior or director.

6. To be content and to rejoice in all humiliations ; to be pleased with mean employments, poor clothes, etc.; to love simplicity and poverty ; and to judge ourselves unworthy and bad servants in everything that is enjoined us.

7. To esteem ourselves baser and more unworthy than every one, even the greatest sinners.

8. To avoid all love of singularity in words and actions.

9. To love and practise silence.

10. To avoid dissolute mirth and loud laughter.

11. Never to speak in a loud voice, and to be modest in our words.

12. To be humble in all our exterior actions, by keeping our eyes humbly cast down with the publican and the penitent Manasses.

## CHAPTER X.

THE invasion of England by the Danes, in the tenth century, caused great disorder in that kingdom, both in the civil and ecclesiastical government, and, as a consequence, many of the clergy lapsed into licentiousness ; contemporaneously, internecine wars in France resulted in a levelling and anti-Christian revolution, destroying, as in England, the whole order of government both in Church and State. Germany became the political rival of France and Italy, and was a seat of faction and civil discord. The Popes were not masters of their own capital ; they were raised to the Pontificate by the dominant party, and some of the Popes so raised gave great scandal by their conduct.

From the general decay of morality and learning, the tenth century is commonly accounted one of the dark ages of the Church ; yet, amidst all these disorders, the Church preserved her doctrine untainted, and her faith was extended over Bulgaria, Hungary, Bohemia, Saxony, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Poland, and Russia.

The centuries which are known as the "Middle Ages" may be reckoned from the ninth to the middle of the fifteenth century. These ages are also essentially the ages of faith ; and, notwithstanding that there were constant changes of almost every kind in the condition of Europe, religion was widely spread by the religious houses.

St. Bruno, born about the year 1030, founded the Order of the Carthusians.\* The Carthusians consecrated themselves to fasting, to silence, to solitude and prayer. Labour succeeded prayer, chiefly in copying pious books. Peter, the venerable Abbot of Cluny, fifty years after St. Bruno's death, writes of them : " Their dress is meaner and poorer than that of other Monks, so short and scanty that the very sight affrights one. They wear coarse hair-shirts next their skin, fast almost perpetually ; eat only bran-bread ; never touch flesh, either sick or well ; never buy fish, but eat it if given in alms ; eat eggs and cheese on Sundays and Thursdays ; on Tuesdays and Saturdays their fare is pulse or herbs boiled ; on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays they take nothing but bread and water, and they have only one meal a day, except within the octaves of Christmas,

\* The Order took its name from the Desert of Chartreuse, near Grenoble, where St. Bruno founded the Monastery of the Grande Chartreuse.

Easter, Whitsuntide, Epiphany, and some other festivals."

St. Bernard founded in 1118 the Cistercian Abbey of the Three Fountains in the Diocese of Chalons, and before his death he founded one hundred and sixty other monasteries. So great was his piety and learning, that all potentates desired to have their differences settled by him. The Popes sought his advice, and it was said of him that even in his solitude he governed all the Churches of the West. He was obliged by Pope Innocent II. to assist at the Council of Pisa, at which the schismatics were excommunicated, and at the conclusion of that Synod was sent to Milan, where he was the means of inducing the Milanese to renounce schism, and of reconciling that city to the Holy See.

St. Dominic in 1215 founded the Order of Friar Preachers, one of the Mendicant Orders sanctioned by the General Council of Lyons in 1274. The Dominicans have established houses in all parts of the world; and their vow of poverty, which testifies to their singleness of purpose, has caused their preaching to be listened to with reverence, and they have thus been of the greatest service in promulgating the truths of the Christian doctrine, and inducing men to lead pure and moral lives. In the same century, St. Francis of Assisium in-

stituted an Order of Friars to preach penance to the world by word and example ; and after ten years five thousand Monks assembled at a General Chapter held at Portiuncula, who were sent by St. Francis into various countries to preach the Gospel. In the following century we find the Carmelites, another of the four Mendicant Orders, acting under their sixth General, St. Simon Stock, doing good service. Each century added fresh developments of zeal for the propagation of religion, adapting their rules to the requirements of the time.

In the fifteenth century was born St. Ignatius Loyola, who at the time of the Reformation founded the celebrated Society of Jesus, which attained such a widely spread influence.

In the sixteenth century St. Philip Neri founded the Congregation of the Oratorians. They were called Oratorians because at certain hours every morning and evening, by ringing a bell, they called the people to prayers and meditations. St. Philip, although an accomplished scholar, devoted himself to the poor, and erected a new hospital for the sick.

The Congregation which bears his name has since been joined by many pious men, who, by preaching and attracting the people, have been the means of diffusing piety in the numerous

places where Congregations have been established. Pierre de Berulle, one of the distinguished ecclesiastics of France of that time, took St. Philip Neri as his model, founded an establishment of Priests of the Oratory, and soon attracted a brilliant band of able and docile young men. So successful was De Berulle, that episcopal seminaries and schools of a higher order were entrusted to his care.

In the same century St. Vincent de Paul established the Congregation of the Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul. A sublime charity dominated St. Vincent, and the spiritual and temporal wants of the working classes were the chief care of the Congregation. The Congregation has extended itself all over the world; it has organised Christian workshops, established orphanages, and in every way diffused a religious spirit among the working classes.

During the seven hundred years which constitute the Middle Ages there is, unfortunately, no doubt that scandals did exist in religious houses from time to time; but the discovery of occasional scandals, during a period extending over centuries, does not warrant the inference of general corruption, upon which some partisan Protestant writers insist. This was by no means the case; the especial mark of the Middle Ages



was unity ; and the whole basis of life, both public and private, was built upon religion. The Christian Commonwealth was a reality, of which the several European States were sections ; and however men might differ on other matters, all agreed in their submission to the Church. A consequence of the religious unity of the medieval period was the position held by the Sovereign Pontiff. Dante has described Constantine as founding his new capital on the Bosphorus that "he might give the Shepherd room"; and, free from proximity of the secular ruler, the Pope consolidated his spiritual authority, and Rome became the centre of a vaster realm than any which had owned the Imperial sway. Europe was considered one vast moral territory, of which the Pope was the supreme magistrate, to whom every one could appeal as the tutelary and incorruptible guardian of truth and justice ; and by general consent the cause of the Popes was that of religion and holiness.

As a consequence, the influence of the Popes was international, and was, in its exercise, most beneficial. M. Guizot writes : "It is a matter of notoriety that, by the truce of God, and many measures of the same kind, the Church struggled against the employment of force, and devoted itself to the introduction into society of a greater degree of order and mildness."



The phrase, "Christian Commonwealth," signified a reality subject to the supremacy of the Pope ; and as we have seen in the earlier chapters of this work, St. Peter was from the first supreme, thus with the development of the constitution of the Church we see the continuity of the Papal supremacy, foreshadowing the decree of the Vatican Council in the present century (1859-70).

Cardinal Newman writes : " The Infinite Wisdom, which sees the end from the beginning in decreeing the rise of an universal empire . . . decreed the development of a ruler."

In these days it is difficult to understand the intense and complete domination of religion in the medieval period : the glorious group of Italian Republics maintained the sacred cause of civil freedom and religious liberty. Municipal liberties, the Guilds and Confraternities of the Middle Ages, breathed the spirit of the Church.

The importance attaching to religion will account for the intolerance of the Middle Ages. Heresy presented itself in a very different aspect from that of our time—a time of religious individualism. In the Middle Ages an attack upon the acknowledged doctrine of the Catholic Church was looked upon as mere blasphemy, and heresies were punished by the civil authorities as infractions of the undoubted Divine law.

However much we may differ in our views in the present time, when indifference largely promotes toleration, we must bear in mind that in the Middle Ages denial of faith was looked upon as the greatest of offences to the public conscience.

The growth of new nationalities, however, in the fourteenth century, and the ambition of the rulers who asserted themselves against the domination of Rome, militated against the influence of the Popes : the medieval order showed signs of decline, and the moral influence of the Popes became much impaired throughout Europe until the period called the Middle Ages closes.

The Papal Court had been transferred to Avignon in 1300 by Clement V. The captivity, however, came to an end in 1376, when Gregory XI. returned to Rome, and a revival of religious influence was hoped for ; but Gregory survived two years only, and his reign was succeeded by the Great Schism. The Archbishop of Bari, a Neapolitan, was unanimously elected Pope in succession to Gregory, and for three months no complaint was heard ; but Urban, from a laudable zeal for effecting reform, exercised a degree of severity which was thought imprudent. In his exhortations and reprimands, he spared not the Cardinals, whose resentment he excited ; and many of them, rather than submit to a curtailment of the luxury in which

they lived, chose to throw the Church into confusion. Twelve Cardinals retired to Anagni, and on the 9th of August, 1378, they published a declaration, in which they pretended that the election of Urban was null by reason of the fear of violence which extorted it, they said, from the electors against their will. They afterwards removed to Fondi, where they were joined by three Italian Cardinals. They declared the Holy See vacant, and proceeded to elect as Pope, Robert of Geneva, one of their number, who took the name of Clement, and endeavoured to establish his authority in the different Courts of Europe. He succeeded with Charles, King of France, and their mutual interest induced him to abandon Italy and fix his residence at Avignon. Italy, Germany, Denmark, Poland, Bohemia, Hungary, Portugal, Flanders, and England acknowledged Urban; and time, the slow but sure discloser of truth, has since shown they were right. Urban was steady in maintaining his own and the Church's cause; the quiet possession of Rome gave him a preponderating weight. He created six and twenty new Cardinals, and declared those who had deserted him excommunicated schismatics. Clement retorted in the same manner, but with less effect. He presided over his party till 1394, when he died, the result of an apoplectic stroke. His adherents

elected as his successor the political Cardinal of Aragon, Peter de Luna, who, under the name of Benedict, carried on the schism for thirty years longer.

The Papal supremacy was, nevertheless, acknowledged by both parties; yet, being tenaciously claimed by two competitors, it appeared for some time doubtful to which of the two it canonically belonged. Hence a door was opened to innumerable abuses, to simony, to sacrilege, and a general corruption of morals, without that check which indisputable authority can give.

The medieval Church had been the one universal instrument of religious dogma, culture, philosophy, physics, art, and education; but as the Papal influence declined in the fourteenth century, a lay movement manifested itself in society, and profane knowledge gradually acquired a territory of its own.

Mill describes this period, a period known as that of the "Renaissance," as the breaking out of the human faculties. Philosophic and speculative theories were promulgated much calculated to undermine religion, which called into existence the Jesuits, who faithfully reflected the characteristics of the age, combated it with its own weapons, and devoted themselves to intellectual education in the widest possible sense.

There is no body of men who have been more persistently and more unjustly attacked than the Jesuits. Macaulay, in his essay on "Ranke's History of the Popes," says :

"Ignatius Loyola, poor, obscure, without a patron, without recommendations, entered the city where now two princely temples, rich with painting and many coloured marble, commemorate his great services to the Church ; where his form stands sculptured in massive silver, where his bones, enshrined amidst jewels, are placed beneath the altar of God. His activity and zeal bore down all opposition ; and under his rule the Order of Jesus began to exist, and grew rapidly to the full measure of his gigantic powers. With what vehemence, with what policy, with what exact discipline, with what dauntless courage, with what self-denial, with what forgetfulness of the dearest ties, with what intense and stubborn devotion to a single end, with what unscrupulous laxity and versatility in the choice of means, the Jesuits fought the battle of their Church is written in every page of the annals of Europe during several generations. In the Order of Jesus was concentrated the quintessence of the Catholic spirit ; and the history of the Order of Jesus is the history of the great Catholic reaction. That Order possessed itself at once of all the strongholds which command the public mind :

of the pulpit, of the Press, of the confessional, of the Academies. Wherever the Jesuit preached, the church was too small for the audience. The name of Jesuit on a title-page secured the circulation of a book. It was in the ears of the Jesuit that the powerful, the noble, and the beautiful breathed the secret history of their lives. It was at the feet of the Jesuit that the youth of the higher and middle classes were brought up from childhood to manhood, from the first rudiments to the courses of rhetoric and philosophy. Literature and science, lately associated with infidelity or with heresy, now became the allies of orthodoxy. Dominant in the South of Europe, the great Order soon went forth conquering and to conquer. In spite of oceans and deserts, hunger and pestilence, of spies and penal laws, of dungeons and racks, of gibbets and quartering blocks, Jesuits were found under every disguise and in every country; scholars, physicians, merchants, serving-men; in the hostile Court of Sweden, in the old manor-houses of Cheshire, among the hovels of Connaught: arguing, instructing, consoling, stealing away the hearts of the young, animating the courage of the timid, holding up the crucifix before the dying. Nor was it less their office to plot against the thrones and lives of apostate kings, to spread evil rumours, to raise tumults, to inflame civil wars, to arm the hand of the



assassin. Inflexible in nothing but in their fidelity to the Church, they were equally ready to appeal to her cause, to the spirit of loyalty, and to the spirit of freedom. Extreme doctrines of obedience and extreme doctrines of liberty, the right of rulers to misgovern the people, the right of every one of the people to plunge his knife in the heart of a bad ruler, were inculcated by the same man, according as he addressed himself to the subject of Philip or the subject of Elizabeth. Some described these divines as most rigid, others as the most indulgent of spiritual directors : and both descriptions are correct. The truly devout listened with awe to the high and saintly morality of the Jesuit.

“The gay cavalier who had run his rival through the body ; the frail beauty who had forgotten her marriage vow, found in the Jesuit an easy, well-bred man of the world, who knew how to make allowance for the little irregularities of people of fashion. The confessor was strict or lax according to the temper of the penitent. His first object was to drive no person out of the pale of the Church. Since there were bad people, it was better that they should be bad Catholics than bad Protestants. If a person was so unfortunate as to be a bravo, a libertine, or a gambler, that was no reason for making him a heretic too.

“The old world was not wide enough for this



strange activity ; the Jesuits invaded all countries which the great maritime discoveries of the preceding ages had laid open to European enterprise. They were found in the depths of the Peruvian mines, at the marts of the African slave caravans, on the shores of the Spice Islands, in the observatories of China. They made converts in regions which neither avarice nor curiosity had tempted any of their countrymen to enter ; and preached and disputed in tongues of which no other native of the West understood a word.

“The spirit of the Order animated the whole Catholic world. The Court of Rome, which in the generation which preceded the Reformation was not free from scandal, was purified ; the change in the spirit of the Catholic world may be traced in every walk of literature and art.”

Macaulay has, by implication at least, given colour to the charge that the Society taught that the end justifies the means. That men whose lives were a continual penance, pious aspiration, and perpetual toil for others, were all the time engaged in conspiracy against religion and morality, is, on the face of it, ridiculous. Voltaire, who naturally disliked the Jesuits on account of their antagonism to his teaching, nevertheless controverts this absurd theory. “*On tachait,*” he writes, “*de prouver qu'ils avait un dessein formé de corrompre les mœurs des*

*hommes, dessein qu'aucune secte, qu'aucune société, n'a jamais eu, ni peut avoir."*

The worst that can truthfully be alleged against the Jesuits is that they, no doubt with a good intention, mixed themselves up with politics, and thus came into collision with the civil authorities. This led to their expulsion from Spain and Portugal; but not, if we accept the opinion of the Duke of Wellington, to the advantage of those countries. "He considered their expulsion an evil to Spain and Portugal. It ruined the education of the upper classes, who were now men of no education, no moral or religious teaching, and are a worthless set."

But my object in quoting Macaulay has not been in order to controvert the revival by him of old fallacies, but because he has, in my opinion, if we exclude all that is fanciful and controversial, presented a clearer idea of the Order than it has been my lot to find elsewhere.

"In the Order of Jesus was concentrated the quintessence of the Catholic spirit." "Inflexible in nothing but in their fidelity to the Church, they were equally ready to appeal in her cause to the spirit of loyalty and to the spirit of freedom," says Macaulay. This is the truth—not an ideal truth, but the absolute truth. The quintessence of the religious spirit dominated the Order. It

had no preference for kings or people, for governors or the governed. Politically, it was flexible in its action: it gave the weight of its authority and influence to the side which favoured religion. It is quite possible that a despot who was tyrannical, or a rebellion without just cause, might have been favoured by the Jesuit according as it seemed to him the interests of religion would be best promoted.

It is only natural that a Society "in which was concentrated the quintessence of the religious spirit" should be dominated by that spirit.

"Inflexible in nothing but in their fidelity to the Church." Yes, self was as nothing, dungeons and martyrdom were as nothing; the Jesuit went everywhere, regardless of climate, disease, and danger, appealing to each population in language which was best suited to it, respecting its customs and traditions so far as was possible without violating religious precepts; but in religion the Jesuit was inflexible. In all countries, Catholic and Protestant, there are bad people; but in all Catholic countries, North or South, kingdoms or republics, the Catholic teaching is uniform. The inflexibility of the Order of Jesus as regards religion is in accordance with the practice of the Church of Rome. Pope Clement VII. lost a kingdom to the Faith by his refusal to sanction the divorce of Henry

VIII. of England. The temptation to acquiesce in Henry's demands was, from the religious point of view, enormous; but such a course was incompatible with his pastoral duty, and he was inflexible. Napoleon was equally unsuccessful in obtaining the Papal sanction to his divorce from the Empress Josephine. These potentates strove to subordinate religion to their worldly interests; but, whatever the shortcomings of the Popes, they cannot be charged with flexibility when the Catholic teaching of faith and morals has been attacked. Prince Talleyrand cautioned his subordinates against "excess of zeal." The Jesuits may have been at times imprudent in their excess of zeal, but their singleness of purpose and their unselfish devotion to the cause of religion cannot be impugned.

In the fourteenth century, besides the disorders of the schism mentioned in the preceding pages, the Church was assailed by a new heresy which had lately been started in England by John Wickliff, who was soured in not being appointed, as he had hoped, Bishop of Worcester. Wickliff had the presumption, or as Dr. Hume, the historian, expresses it, "had the honour of being the first to call in question the doctrines which had certainly passed as certain and indisputable for so many ages. They were nearly the same as those propagated in the sixteenth century."

Wickliff was called to account by the bishops ; he attempted to explain his expressions in an orthodox sense, and on a promise not again to disturb the public peace, was allowed to depart. Under the protection of the Duke of Lancaster, the King's uncle, he, however, continued to disseminate his doctrines with impunity. His followers are known by the name of the Lollards. The effects of Wickliff's principles soon appeared in a most destructive shape. A levelling spirit of independence sprang up among the lower class of people, which carried them to the most outrageous excesses against all law and order. An itinerant preacher, by name John Ball, preached equality and the natural right to a like share in every kind of property. This led to riots ; and the Lollards, influenced by their democratic heroes, Wat Tyler, Jack Shaw, and Tom Millar, plundered and burnt down the houses of the rich.

The teaching of Wickliff, although quite distinct from the religious revolt which Luther initiated, nevertheless prepared the way for the Protestant Reformation. The leaders of the new learning were indefatigable in exposing religious abuses, and they thus impaired popular respect for ecclesiastical institutions and authority. The active participation of the Popes in politics was also, under the altered conditions of society, de-

trimental to religion. It furnished an obvious ground of attack which it was, in many cases, difficult to repel. Erasmus, when he visited Italy in 1506, met Julius II. at the head of an army ; but Erasmus, while deprecating abuses damaging to religion, differed essentially from Luther. In 1529 he writes : " The sins of men in no manner warranted the rejection of the doctrines of faith."

If the doctrines of Wickliff had not extended beyond the British shores, their suppression would have been comparatively easy ; they were, unfortunately, carried into Bohemia by students who had come to England for the advantage of education in the University of Oxford, and adopted by Huss and other professors of divinity ; moreover, these doctrines by degrees found favour in many parts of Europe, and were so freely propagated that in the fifteenth century (1418) they were formally condemned by the Council of Constance. This Council also put an end to the schism of the conflicting claims to the Popedom when Martin V. was universally acknowledged for lawful Pope.

In this century—1349—was held the Council of Florence.

The Greeks, notwithstanding that they had at the Council of Lyons, 1274, made a full profession of the orthodox faith, including the procession of



the Holy Ghost from the Father *and the Son*, nevertheless continued their schismatic teaching on this point, which caused the matter to be again discussed at this Council, at which it was decreed as follows :

“ In the name of the holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, by the approbation of this sacred and Ecumenical Council assembled at Florence, we define . . . that the Holy Ghost eternally proceeds from the Father *and the Son* as from one principle and one simple spiration.”

The importance of this decree is best appreciated by the fact that it uncompromisingly sets forth the dogma of the Blessed Trinity, which has ever since been the basis of faith.\*

At this Council the Greeks for the last time united with the Catholic Church. After their separation from the Church they had often sought and obtained a reunion ; but their reunion had never been of long duration. At this Council the Armenians were also admitted to union with the Catholic Church. The union of the Greeks did not last long : in 1443 the Patri-

\* The Creed as amended is the authorised Creed included in the Ordinary of the Mass and in the Anglican Book of Common Prayer. It has always been known as the “ Nicene Creed,” as the *filioque* was considered, accurately speaking, neither a change nor an addition, but simply an explanatory clause intended to bring out the meaning of the symbol more fully and explicitly.

archs of Alexandria, of Antioch, and Jerusalem, assembled in Synod and declared against the union, and in 1452 a general revolt threw everything into anarchy and confusion. The Monks, the clergy, part of the Senate, and the people, rose tumultuously at once, proclaimed the union at an end, and thenceforth renounced all communion with the Latin Church.

This last infidelity of the Greeks filled the measure of their public crimes. Little of the once extensive Eastern Empire remained, and Mohammed put the finishing stroke to its destruction by the capture of Constantinople.

The expulsion of the Moors from Spain in this century was no doubt favourable to the interests of the Church ; but the danger to which the Western states of Europe were exposed by the fall of Constantinople was foreseen by the discerning Pontiff, Pius II., who invited the Christian Princes to meet him by deputy at Mantua, in order that they might unite in one common league against the encroaching infidel. The Papal action was well designed ; but dangerous as was the infidel advance, there was a greater danger brewing by the revolt of Luther, which Pius did not survive to witness.

## CHAPTER XI.

THE sixteenth century presents very special interests, but with very lamentable results. The lapse of twelve centuries had materially impaired the Basilica of St. Peter, which Constantine the Great first erected on the Vatican hill. The fabric was in a decayed state, and it was deemed expedient to replace it upon a much more magnificent scale. A plan was drawn by Bramante, which was laid before the celebrated Michael Angelo, and, subject to modifications by the latter, was approved by Leo. The sum in his treasury not being equal to the expense, he solicited the pious generosity of the faithful at large. For the encouragement of those who were inclined to contribute towards a work solely destined for the Divine worship, Leo attached an indulgence to their religious contributions.

An indulgence is no more than a relaxation of the temporal punishment due to sins after their guilt has been remitted by the Sacrament of Penance—that is to say, the gates of Heaven are closed to persons in mortal sin ; but, by availing

themselves of the Sacrament of Confession, they can obtain absolution so far as to be re-admitted to a state of grace ; but the debt of temporal punishment often remains after their guilt or everlasting punishment is remitted. Under this persuasion of a twofold punishment, the one eternal, the other only temporal, the Church enacted her penitential canons. The penances enjoined were often rigorous and of long duration. The pastors of the Church sometimes mitigated or shortened these canonical penances when there appeared sufficient reason. St. Paul showed this indulgence to the incestuous Corinthian, in consideration of the singular marks he gave of sincere sorrow. Similar indulgences were shown to other sinners at the request of those who were going to shed their blood for Christ, as St. Cyprian witnessed. In process of time experience showed that the rigour of a long course of penance deterred men from the practice of repentance more than from the commission of sin : the Church then mitigated the penances, and substituted good works in satisfaction for sins committed. This doctrine has been much misunderstood by Protestant writers, some of whom have falsely asserted that sins are wiped out according to a scale of charges. It is not, however, difficult to understand this doctrine, as it is universally practised ; the great majority of religious persons of all

denominations, whose consciences reproach them, give alms, or do other good works in reparation for their sins. For the publication of the indulgences granted by Leo (A.D. 1517) preachers were nominated in every state of Europe to explain their nature and their spiritual effect according to the doctrine of the Catholic Church. The Order of the Augustinian Friars had been usually appointed to preach these indulgences; but on this occasion they had the mortification to see the Dominicans preferred before them. Luther, Doctor and Professor of Divinity in the new University of Wittemberg, and a member of the Order of the Augustinian Friars, resented this, and commenced a violent attack upon the indulgences. There was much to justify Luther in his denunciation of indulgences as offered by Tetzel and some of the Dominican preachers, who were said to have been guilty of many irregularities, and were accused of converting the contributions of the faithful to their own profit. Luther was gifted with considerable powers of oratory. He was virulent; bitter in his invectives; he accommodated his language to his audience, and by wholesale abuse and scurrility gained the applause and admiration of his enthusiastic partisans. The popularity he thereby gained, and the support he received from the University of Wit-

temberg, and from Frederic, the Elector of Saxony, facilitated his subsequent attack upon Catholic doctrine. Luther preached the doctrines of Wickliff and Huss; opposed the Catholic doctrine of original sin, justification, and the Sacraments. Henry VIII. of England composed a treatise, assisted by Bishop Fisher, upon the seven Sacraments, in refutation of Luther's doctrines, which gained for him, from the Pope, the title of Defender of the Faith—a title retained by the Kings of England to the present day.

Luther's followers were in the position of either accepting him as their guide, or relying on their private judgment. Luther inculcated that every one should examine theological questions, taking as a standard the Bible. As a consequence, various interpretations of the Scriptures were promulgated. Vinet has well observed: "*On ne voit dans la bible que ce qu'on veut. On abonde dans le sens de la vérité qu'on a choisie, en sorte que dans le fait chacun a sa bible. Tous les oiseaux de l'air depuis l'oiseau de la nuit jusqu'à l'aigle l'ami du soleil font leurs nids dans les rameaux de cet arbre immense.*"

As Luther on his own authority attacked Catholic dogma, so his teaching was denounced with equal authority by other reformers. Various sects arose, all antagonistic to Rome, but hardly less bitter towards each other. This led Luther to



assert himself as an authoritative teacher, and as he could not claim a direct mission from God he invoked the aid of the civil power. The influence of the Church had already been much impaired in many countries, and princes, glad to assert their power, suppressed every opinion in matters of faith which differed from their own, and hence the effect of the Lutheran Reformation in countries which received it was to obliterate from the minds and consciences of people that Christian men live under another and a higher law than the law of the State. Civil Governments, without any authority from God, dogmatised in matters of religion ; but Acts of Parliament or decrees in the courts of law, which defined the State religions, were useful only in support of those religions, because they carried with them the emoluments of the Church.

Dissent soon, however, made itself felt. State decrees, being without authority or guide upon which to base their decisions, were denounced. At the best they were looked upon as emanating from the private judgment of individuals, and were not free from the suspicion that they were arrived at rather in the interest of the State than of religion. Numerous sects sprang up, based upon private judgment, and Christianity in Protestant States, instead of being represented by one Catho-

lic and Apostolic Church, the universal teacher, became a religion in splinters.

In the Northern parts of Europe, Protestantism gained ground rapidly. Sovereigns were glad to appropriate to themselves the prerogatives of the Pope, and to share with the nobles the plunder of the abbeys. Alone among the Northern nations, Ireland adhered to the ancient Faith. In England, Scotland, Denmark, Sweden, Livonia, Prussia, Saxony, Hesse, Wurtemberg, several centres in Switzerland, in Northern Netherlands, the Reformation triumphed, and in all other countries north of the Alps and Pyrenees it seemed on the point of triumphing; but while the Protestant Reformation proceeded rapidly at one extremity of Europe, the Catholic revival went on as rapidly at the other. About half a century after the great separation there were throughout the North Protestant governments and Protestant nations. In the South were governments and nations actuated by the most intense zeal for the ancient Church. Between these two hostile regions lay, morally as well as geographically, a great debatable land.

In France, Belgium, Southern Germany, Hungary, and Poland the contest was still undecided.

The history of the two succeeding generations is the history of the struggle between Protestantism possessed of the North of Europe and Catholicism

possessed of the South, for the doubtful territory which lay between.

The state of things acted as a warning to the Catholic Church no longer to delay the much needed reform, and resulted in the Council of Trent. All the institutions anciently devised for the propagation and defence of the Faith were furnished up and made efficient; everywhere old religious communities were remodelled and new religious communities called into existence. The Capuchins restored the old Franciscan discipline, the midnight prayer, and life of silence. The Barnabites devoted themselves to the relief and education of the poor. The Theatines supplied the deficiencies of the parochial clergy. The result was a Catholic reaction, in which the celebrated Ignatius Loyola played so remarkable a part. The spirit of the Order of Jesus animated the whole Catholic world. At first the chances appeared in favour of Protestantism; but victory remained with the Church of Rome. The Church was victorious in France, Belgium, Bavaria, Bohemia, Austria, Poland, and Hungary. Nor has Protestantism, in the course of two hundred years, been able to reconquer any portion of what was then lost.

In 1542, Pope Paul III. had established the Tribunal of the Inquisition, with the object of sup-

pressing and uprooting the errors which were rife in the Christian community. The Inquisition only pronounced persons guilty of heresy. It left to the civil authorities the infliction of punishment. At the present day we hold that the persecution which the Protestants suffered cannot be justified, and that it injured the cause which it was intended to serve. In extenuation of the policy, we should remember that the doctrine of toleration of our time was then unknown. Heresy in those days was looked upon as a revolt, not only against religion, but against all constituted authority. How much soever we may reprobate the persecution of heretics, if we throw ourselves into the spirit of the age, we can, in a measure, understand the policy upon which persecution was based. But it is impossible to explain or extenuate the Protestant persecutions. The various new Protestant sects persecuted those who differed from them with a severity rivalling that employed in defence of the old religion. Circumstances in extenuation of persecuting those who attacked the hitherto venerated religion of the State may be alleged; but what excuse can be offered for persecuting those who adhered to their religion, because they refused to forswear themselves and adopt the creed of a newly founded sect. Calvin compassed the death of Servetus, as good a Protestant as Calvin, simply

because he did not agree with him ; but the most outrageous and most unjustifiable persecution that the world has ever known was carried out in Great Britain on the accession of Queen Elizabeth to the throne. Before the least hostility to her Government had been shown by the Catholic population, an Act was passed prohibiting the celebration of the rites of the Roman Church, on pain of forfeiture for the first offence, of a year's imprisonment for the second, and of perpetual imprisonment for the third. A law, next made in 1562, enacted that all who had ever graduated at the universities or received Holy Orders, all lawyers and all magistrates, should take the oath of supremacy when tendered to them, on pain of forfeiture and imprisonment during the Royal pleasure. After a lapse of three months the oath might be again tendered to them, and if again refused, the recusant was guilty of high treason.

The persecution of the Protestants, however much we may deplore it, was resorted to in the cause of religion. Heresy was looked upon as more deadly than disease ; disease could only destroy the body ; heresy involved loss of the soul. The motive was religious : where the salvation of souls was in question, heresy was to be stamped out at any price. But in the persecution of the Catholics there was no pretence of a religious motive ; more-

over, the Elizabethan persecutions differed from those inflicted upon the Protestants. The Protestants attacked a religion which was held in high honour, and held to be sacred; whereas the penalties against the Catholics were, on the accession of Elizabeth, enacted before any attack had been made by them upon the constituted authorities: they were, moreover, retrospective enactments, against a large class, for simply continuing in the Faith in which they had been baptised. English Protestantism racked, hung, cut down alive and ripped open Jesuits, priests and laity, because they were loyal to the ancient Faith. Puritans received hardly less vigorous treatment. In Germany those who differed from the opinions of Luther were similarly dealt with.

In England, from the time of Henry VIII., religion has been subordinated to the State. The Sovereign claimed supremacy. Edward persecuted Catholics. Mary persecuted Protestants. Elizabeth persecuted Catholics again. The father of those three Sovereigns had enjoyed the pleasure of persecuting both sects at once and had sent to death on the same hurdle the heretic who denied the Real Presence and the traitor who denied the Royal supremacy.

The flexibility of the wise and cautious Burleigh shows the importance of standing well with the



Sovereign in those times. Burleigh defended the supremacy of Henry VIII., and was an excellent Protestant when it was not very advantageous to be a Papist. He sought the protection of Mary. He confessed himself, heard Mass, and for the better ordering of his spiritual concerns took a priest into his house. On the death of Mary he was sworn in Privy Councillor and Secretary of State to Elizabeth.

Burleigh was an able statesman, and his sagacity enabled him to promote the material welfare of the nation as well as his own private interests. He left three hundred distinct landed estates and considering the times in which he lived, he probably, like Clive, was astonished at his own moderation.

## CHAPTER XII.

---

### THE COUNCIL OF TRENT, 1545—1564.

WHENEVER any violent attempt has been made to alter the doctrines of the Catholic Church, recourse has been had to a General Council as the most effectual means for preserving the integrity of faith and checking the progress of error. This course was pursued, as we have seen, against the Arians in 325, against the Macedonians in 381, against the Nestorians in 430, against the Eutychians in 451, against the Monothelites in 680, against the Iconoclasts in 757, and against the Photians in 869.

In the instances mentioned the heresies raised have been of a concrete character, and the discussions ranged over one or two definite points. The Protestant outbreak in the sixteenth century was diffuse; in different countries different doctrines of the Church were attacked; the leaders of the revolt differed from one another. To defend the orthodox doctrine as against any one sect was to

strike at one development only : the sect struck at had disappeared on the morrow ; it had, perhaps, fused with some other teaching, or struck out a new development of itself. Protestantism was a mist. It raged, it asserted, it denied. Luther taught one thing ; Calvin differed. Servetus again, in a measure the pupil of Calvin, disagreed with him.

In one opinion only did Luther and Calvin agree ; they both bore testimony to the evil effects of the revolt. Luther says : " Men are now more revengeful, more covetous, and more licentious than they were ever in the Papacy ; every man then willingly performed good works ; but now no man says or knows anything but how to get all to himself by exactions, pillage, theft, lying, and usury." Calvin says : " What else did the greater part pretend to, but by shaking off the yoke of superstition to give themselves more liberty to follow all kinds of licentiousness."

It was in these circumstances that the Council of Trent was convoked by Pope Paul III., in December, 1545.

By different prorogations the Council was protracted to the year 1563, under four successive Popes—Julius III., Marcellus II., Paul V., and Pius IV.—and the decrees were not confirmed by the Pope until January 26th, 1564.

At this Council the whole ground of theology, morals, and discipline was discussed, and the true teaching of the Church enunciated.

The Council was presided over by the legates of the Apostolic See. The Papal legates appointed in the first instance were Giammaria di Monte, Bishop of Palestrina ; Marcello Cervini, and Reginald Pope. The first named was afterwards created Pope under the name of Julius III.; the second also succeeded to the Apostolic throne, under whose reigns the Council was protracted

The first decree of importance after the opening of the Council relates to the symbol of faith, which is as follows :

“ I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible ; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, and born of the Father before all ages ; God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God ; begotten, not made ; consubstantial with the Father, by Whom all things were made : and Who, for us men and our salvation, came down from the heavens, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man ; crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, He suffered and was buried ; and He rose again on the third day, according to the Scriptures ; and He ascended into Heaven, sitteth on the right

hand of the Father ; and again He will come with glory to judge the living and the dead ; of Whose kingdom there shall be no end ; And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and the giver of life, Who proceedeth from the Father and Son, Who, with the Father and the Son together, is adored and glorified ; Who spoke by the Prophets. And one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. I confess one baptism for the remission of sins ; and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and life of the world to come. Amen."

The following decrees were agreed to in the order of succession as given below, viz.:

DECREES CONCERNING THE CANONICAL  
SCRIPTURES.

*Of the Old Testament.*—The five books of Moses, to wit, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy ; Josue, Judges, Ruth, four books of Kings, two of Paralipomenon, the first book of Esdras, and the second which is entitled Nehemias ; Tobias, Judith, Esther, Job, the Psalter called David's, consisting of one hundred and fifty Psalms ; the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Cantic of Canticles, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Isaias, Jeremias, with Baruch ; Ezechiel, Daniel ; the twelve minor Prophets, to wit, Osee, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Micheas, Nahum, Habacuc, Soph-

onias, Aggæus, Zacharias, Malachias; two books of the Machabees, the first and second.

*Of the New Testament.*—The four Gospels according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; the Acts of the Apostles, written by Luke the Evangelist; fourteen Epistles of Paul the Apostle: (one) to the Romans, (two) to the Corinthians, (one) to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, to the Philippians, to the Colossians, (two) to the Thesalonians, (two) to Timothy, (one) to Titus, to Philemon, to the Hebrews; two of Peter the Apostle, three of John the Apostle, one of James the Apostle, one of Jude the Apostle, and the Apocalypse of John the Apostle.

DECREE CONCERNING THE EDITION AND THE  
USE OF THE SACRED BOOKS.

Declares that the old and Vulgate edition, which by lengthened usage of so many ages has been approved of in the Church, be held as authentic; and in order to restrain petulant spirits, it decrees that no one relying on his own skill shall, in matters of faith and of morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine, wresting the sacred Scriptures to his own senses, presume to interpret the said Scripture contrary to that sense which holy Mother Church—whose it is to judge of the



true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures—hath held and doth hold. It further ordains that it shall not be lawful for any one to print, or cause to be printed, any books whatever on sacred matters, unless examined and approved of by the Ordinary.

#### DECREE CONCERNING ORIGINAL SIN.

Condemns any one who asserts that the prevarication of Adam injured himself alone, and not his posterity ; and that the holiness and justice received of God, which he lost, he lost for himself alone and not for us also ; and that he, being defiled by the sin of disobedience, has only transfused death and pains of the body into the whole human race ; but not sin also, which is the death of the soul, whereby he contradicts the Apostle, who says : “ By one man sin entered into the world, and by sin death, and so death passed upon all men, in whom all have sinned ” (Rom. v. 12).

It condemns any one who asserts that this sin of Adam is taken away, either by the powers of human nature, or by any other remedy than the merit of the one Mediator, our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath reconciled us to God in His own Blood, made unto us justice, sanctification, and redemption ; or, if he denies that the said merit of Jesus

Christ is applied, both to adults and to infants, by the Sacrament of Baptism rightly administered in the form of the Church. "As many as have been baptised have put on Christ" (Gal. iii. 27).

The holy Synod nevertheless declares that it is not its intention to include in this decree, where original sin is treated of, the Blessed and Immaculate Virgin Mary, the Mother of God.

#### DECREE OF JUSTIFICATION.

Declares the inability of nature and of the law to justify man ; and that God sent His Son, Jesus Christ, that He might redeem the Jews who were under the law, and that the Gentiles who followed not after justice might attain to justice ; and that all men might receive the adoption of sons.

The Council issued thirty-three canons on this subject, viz.:

*Canon 1.*—If any one saith that man may be justified before God by his own works, whether done through the teaching of human nature, or that of the law, without the grace of God through Jesus Christ ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 2.*—If any one saith that the grace of God, through Jesus Christ, is only given for this, that man may be able more easily to live justly, and to merit eternal life, as if, by free will without grace,

he were able to do both, though hardly indeed and with difficulty ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 3.*—If any one saith that without the prevenient inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and without His help, man can believe, hope, love, or be penitent as he ought, so as that the grace of justification may be bestowed upon him ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 4.*—If any one saith that man's free will, moved and excited by God, by assenting to God exciting and calling, nowise co-operates towards disposing and preparing itself for obtaining the grace of justification ; that it cannot refuse its consent, if it would ; but that, as something inanimate, it does nothing whatever and is merely passive ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 5.*—If any one saith that, since Adam's sin, the free will of man is lost and extinguished ; or, that it is a thing with only a name, yea a name without a reality, a figment, in fine, introduced into the Church by Satan ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 6.*—If any one saith that it is not in man's power to make his ways evil, but that the works which are evil God worketh as well as those that are good, not permissively only, but properly, and of Himself, in such wise that the treason of Judas is no less His own proper work than the vocation of Paul ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 7.*—If any one saith that all works done before justification, in whatsoever way they be done, are truly sins, or merit the hatred of God ; or that the more earnestly one strives to dispose himself for grace, the more grievously he sins ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 8.*—If any one saith the fear of hell—whereby, by grieving for our sins, we flee unto the mercy of God, or refrain from sinning—is a sin, or makes sinners worse ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 9.*—If any one saith that by faith alone the impious is justified ; in such wise as to mean that nothing else is required to co-operate in order to the obtaining the grace of justification, and that it is not in any way necessary that he be prepared and disposed by the movement of his own will ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 10.*—If any one saith that men are just without the justice of Christ, whereby He merited for us to be justified ; or that it is by that justice itself that they are formally just ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 11.*—If any one saith that men are justified either by the sole imputation of the justice of Christ, or by the sole remission of sins, to the exclusion of the grace and the charity which is poured forth in their hearts by the Holy Ghost, and is inherent in them ; or even that by the grace whereby

we are justified, is only the favour of God ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 12.*—If any one saith that justifying faith is nothing else but confidence in the Divine mercy which remits sins for Christ's sake ; or that this confidence alone is that whereby we are justified ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 13.*—If any one saith that it is necessary for every one, for the obtaining the remission of sins, that he believe for certain, and without any wavering arising from his own infirmity and indisposition, that his sins are forgiven him ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 14.*—If any one saith that man is truly absolved from his sins and justified, because that he assuredly believed himself absolved and justified ; or that no one is truly justified but he who believes himself justified ; and that by this faith alone absolution and justification are effected ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 15.*—If any one saith that a man, who is born again and justified, is bound by faith to believe that he is assuredly in the number of the predestinate ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 16.*—If any one saith that he will for certain, of an absolute and infallible certainty, have that great gift of perseverance unto the end, unless he have learned this by special revelation ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 17.*—If any one saith that the grace of justification is only attained to by those who are predestined unto life ; but that all others who are called are called indeed, but receive not grace, as being, by the Divine power, predestined unto evil ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 18.*—If any one saith that the commandments of God are, even for one that is justified and constituted in grace, impossible to keep ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 19.*—If any one saith that nothing besides faith is commanded in the Gospel ; that other things are indifferent, neither commanded nor prohibited, but free ; or that the Ten Commandments nowise appertain to Christians ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 20.*—If any one saith that the man who is justified, and how perfect soever, is not bound to observe the commandments of God and of the Church, but only to believe ; as if indeed the Gospel were a bare and absolute promise of eternal life, without the condition of observing the commandments ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 21.*—If any one saith that Jesus Christ was given of God to men, as a redeemer in whom to trust, and not also as a legislator whom to obey ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 22.*—If any one saith that the justified,

either is able to persevere, without the special help of God, in the justice received ; or that, with that help, he is not able ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 23.*—If any one saith that a man once justified can sin no more, nor lose grace, and that, therefore, he that falls and sins was never truly justified ; or, on the other hand, that he is able, during his whole life, to avoid all sins, even those that are venial, except by a special privilege from God, as the Church holds in regard of the Blessed Virgin ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 24.*—If any one saith that the justice received is not preserved and also increased before God through good works ; and that the said works are merely the fruits and signs of justification obtained, but not a cause of the increase thereof ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 25.*—If any one saith that, in every good work, the just sins venially at least ; or, which is more intolerable still, mortally, and consequently deserves eternal punishments ; and for this cause only he is not damned, that God does not impute those works unto damnation ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 26.*—If any one saith that the just ought not, for their good works done in God, to expect and hope for an eternal recompense from God, through His mercy and the merit of Jesus Christ, if so be that they persevere to the end in well-



doing and in keeping the Divine commandments ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 27.*—If any one saith that there is no mortal sin but that of infidelity (unbelief) ; or, that grace once received is not lost by any other sin, however grievous and enormous, save by that of infidelity ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 28.*—If any one saith that grace being lost through sin, faith also is always lost with it ; or, that faith which remains, though it be not a lively faith, is not a true faith ; or, that he who has faith without charity, is not a Christian ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 29.*—If any one saith that he who has fallen after baptism is not able, by the grace of God, to rise again ; or, that he is able indeed to recover the justice which he has lost, but by faith alone, without the Sacrament of Penance, contrary to what the Holy Roman and Universal Church—instructed by Christ and His Apostles—has hitherto professed, observed, and taught ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 30.*—If any one saith that, if after the grace of justification has been received, to every penitent sinner the guilt is remitted, and the debt of eternal punishment is blotted out in such wise, that there remains not any debt of temporal punishment to be discharged either in this world

or in the next in Purgatory, before the entrance into the kingdom of Heaven can be opened (to him); let him be anathema.

*Canon 31.*—If any one saith that the justified sins when he performs good works with a view to an eternal recompense; let him be anathema.

*Canon 32.*—If any one saith that the good works of one that is justified are in such manner the gift of God, as that they are not also the good merits of him that is justified; or, that the said justified, by the good works which he performs through the grace of God and the merit of Jesus Christ, whose living member he is, does not truly merit increase of grace, eternal life, and the attainment of that eternal life—if so be, however, that he depart in grace—and also an increase of glory; let him be anathema.

*Canon 33.*—If any one saith that, by the Catholic doctrine touching justification, by this holy Synod set forth in this present decree, the glory of God, or the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ are in any way derogated from, and not rather that the truth of our faith, and the glory in fine of God and of Jesus Christ are rendered (more) illustrious; let him be anathema.

#### DECREE ON THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL.

*Canon 1.*—If any one saith that the Sacraments

of the New Law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord ; or that they were more or less than seven, to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony ; or even that any of these seven is not truly and properly a Sacrament ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 2.*—If any one saith that these Sacraments of the New Law do not differ from the Sacraments of the Old Law, save that the ceremonies are different, and different the outward rites ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 3.*—If any one saith that these seven Sacraments are in such wise equal to each other, as that one is not in any way more worthy than another ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 4.*—If any one saith that the Sacraments of the New Law are not necessary unto salvation, but superfluous ; and that without them, or without the desire thereof, men obtain of God, through faith alone, the grace of justification, though all (the Sacraments) are not indeed necessary for every individual ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 5.*—If any one saith that these Sacraments were instituted for the sake of nourishing faith alone ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 6.*—If any one saith that the Sacraments of the New Law do not contain the grace which they

signify ; or, that they do not confer that grace on those who do not place an obstacle thereunto : as though they were merely outward signs of grace or justice received through faith, and certain marks of the Christian profession, whereby believers are distinguished amongst men from unbelievers ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 7.*—If any one saith that grace, as far as God's part is concerned, is not given through the said Sacraments always, and to all men, even though they receive them rightly, but (only) sometimes, and to some persons ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 8.*—If any one saith that by the said Sacraments of the New Law grace is not conferred through the act performed, but that faith alone in the Divine promise suffices for the obtaining of grace ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 9.*—If any one saith that in the three Sacraments, to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, and Order, there is not imprinted in the soul a character, that is, a certain spiritual and indelible sign, on account of which they cannot be repeated ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 10.*—If any one saith that all Christians have power to administer the Word, and all the Sacraments ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 11.*—If any one saith that in ministers, when they effect and confer the Sacraments, there

is not required the intention, at least, of doing what the Church does ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 12.*—If any one saith that a minister, being in mortal sin—if so be that he observe all the essentials which belong to the effecting or conferring of the Sacraments—neither effects nor confers the Sacrament ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 13.*—If any one saith that the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church, wont to be used in the solemn administration of the Sacraments, may be condemned, or without sin be omitted at pleasure by the ministers, or be changed, by every pastor of the churches, into other new ones ; let him be anathema.

#### BAPTISM.

*Canon 1.*—If any one saith that the baptism of John had the same force as the baptism of Christ ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 2.*—If any one saith that the true and natural water is not of necessity for baptism, and, on that account, wrests, to some sort of metaphor, those words of our Lord Jesus Christ : “ Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost ” ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 3.*—If any one saith that in the Roman Church, which is the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, there is not the true doctrine concerning the Sacrament of Baptism ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 4.*—If any one saith that the baptism which is even given by heretics in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, with the intention of doing what the Church doth, is not true baptism ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 5.*—If any one saith that baptism is free, that is, not necessary unto salvation ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 6.*—If any one saith that one who has been baptised cannot, even if he would, lose grace, let him sin ever so much, unless he will not believe ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 7.*—If any one saith that the baptised are, by baptism itself, made debtors but to faith alone, and not to the observance of the whole law of Christ ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 8.*—If any one saith that the baptised are free from all the precepts, whether written or transmitted, of Holy Church, in such wise that they are not bound to observe them, unless they have chosen of their own accord to submit themselves thereunto ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 9.*—If any one saith that the remembrance of the baptism which they have received is so to be recalled unto men, as that they are to understand that all vows made after baptism are void, in virtue of the promise already made in

that baptism ; as if, by those vows, they both derogated from that faith which they have professed and from that baptism itself ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 10.*—If any one saith that by the sole remembrance and the faith of the baptism which has been received, all sins committed after baptism are either remitted or made venial ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 11.*—If any one saith that baptism, which was truly and rightly conferred, is to be repeated for him who has denied the faith of Christ among infidels, when he is converted unto penitence ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 12.*—If any one saith that no one is to be baptised, save at that age at which Christ was baptised, or in the very article of death ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 13.*—If any one saith that little children, for that they have not actual faith, are not, after having received baptism, to be reckoned amongst the faithful ; and that, for this cause, they are to be re-baptised when they have attained to years of discretion ; or that it is better that the baptism of such be omitted, than that, while not believing by their own act, they should be baptised in the faith alone of the Church ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 14.*—If any one saith that those who have



been thus baptised when children, are, when they have grown up, to be asked whether they will ratify what their sponsors promised in their names when they were baptised ; and that in case they answer that they will not, they are to be left to their own will ; and are not to be compelled, meanwhile, to a Christian life by any other penalty, save that they be excluded from the participation of the Eucharist, and of the other Sacraments until they repent ; let him be anathema.

#### CONFIRMATION.

*Canon 1.*—If any one saith that the confirmation of those who have been baptised is an idle ceremony, and not a true and proper Sacrament ; or that of old it was nothing more than a kind of catechism, whereby they who were near adolescence gave an account of their faith in the face of the Church ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 2.*—If any one saith that they who ascribe any virtue to the sacred chrism of confirmation offer an outrage to the Holy Ghost ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 3.*—If any one saith that the ordinary minister of confirmation is not the bishop alone, but any simple priest soever, let him be anathema.

ON THE REAL PRESENCE OF OUR LORD JESUS  
CHRIST IN THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF  
THE EUCHARIST.

That in the august Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the species of those sensible things. For neither are these things mutually repugnant that our Saviour Himself, always sitting at the right hand of the Father in Heaven, according to the natural mode of existing, nevertheless, be, in many other places, sacramentally present to us in His own substance, by a manner of existing which, though we can scarcely express it in words, yet can we, by the understanding illuminated by faith, conceive, and we ought most firmly to believe, to be possible unto God: . . . “He gave them His own Body, and His own Blood;” words which, recorded by the holy Evangelists and afterwards repeated by St. Paul, carry with them that proper and most manifest meaning in which they were understood by the Fathers, and it is, indeed, a crime the most unworthy that they should be wrested, by certain contentious and wicked men, to fictitious and imaginary tropes, whereby the verity of the flesh and blood of Christ is denied,

contrary to the universal sense of the Church, which, as the pillar and ground of truth, has detested, as satanical, these inventions devised by impious men. . . .

#### ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

And because Christ, our Redeemer, declared that which He offered under the species of bread to be truly His own Body, therefore has it ever been a firm belief in the Church of God, and this holy Synod doth now declare it anew, that, by the consecration of the bread and of the wine, a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the Body of Christ our Lord, and of the substance of the wine into the substance of His Blood ; which conversion is, by the Holy Catholic Church, suitably and properly called Transubstantiation.

#### CANONS ON THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST.

The Synod, having had before it articles extracted from the conflicting writings of the Protestants on the holy Eucharist, met the various heresies contained in them by the following canons, viz.:

*Canon 1.*—If any one denieth that in the Sacrament of the most holy Eucharist are contained,

truly, really, and substantially, the Body and Blood, together with the soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and, consequently, the whole Christ ; but saith that He is only there as a sign, or in figure, or virtue ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 2.*—If any one saith that in the sacred and holy Sacrament of the Eucharist the substance of the bread and wine remains conjointly with the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and denieth that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood—the species only of the bread and wine remaining—which conversion, indeed, the Catholic Church most aptly calls Transubstantiation ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 3.*—If any one denieth that, in the venerable Sacrament of the Eucharist, the whole Christ is contained under each species, and under every part of each species, when separated ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 4.*—If any one saith that after the consecration is completed, the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are not in the admirable Sacrament of the Eucharist, but (are there) only during the use, whilst it is being taken, and not either before or after ; and that in the hosts or consecrated particles, which are reserved, or which

remain after Communion, the true Body of the Lord remaineth not ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 5.*—If any one saith either that the principal fruit of the most holy Eucharist is the remission of sins, or that other effects do not result therefrom ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 6.*—If any one saith that, in the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, is not to be adored with the worship, even external, of latria ; and is, consequently, neither to be venerated with a special festive solemnity, nor to be solemnly borne about in processions, according to the laudable and universal rite and custom of Holy Church ; or, is not to be exposed publicly to the people to be adored, and that the adorers thereof are idolaters ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 7.*—If any one saith that it is not lawful for the sacred Eucharist to be reserved in the sacrarium, but that immediately after consecration it must necessarily be distributed amongst those present ; or, that it is not lawful to be carried with honour to the sick ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 8.*—If any one saith that Christ, given in the Eucharist, is eaten spiritually only, and not also sacramentally and really ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 9.*—If any one denieth that all and each

of Christ's faithful of both sexes are bound, when they have attained to years of discretion, to communicate every year, at least at Easter, in accordance with the precept of Mother Church ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 10.*—If any one saith that it is not lawful for the celebrating priest to communicate himself ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 11.*—If any one saith that faith alone is a sufficient preparation for receiving the Sacrament of the most holy Eucharist ; let him be anathema. And for fear lest so great a Sacrament may be received unworthily, and so unto death and condemnation, this holy Synod ordains and declares that sacramental confession, when a confessor may be had, is of necessity to be made beforehand, by those whose conscience is burthened with mortal sin, how contrite even soever they may think themselves. But if any one shall presume to teach, preach, or obstinately assert, or even in public disputation to defend the contrary, he shall thereupon be excommunicated.

#### ON THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF PENANCE.

*Canon 1.*—If any one saith that in the Catholic Church Penance is not truly and properly a Sacrament, instituted by Christ our Lord for reconciling the faithful unto God, as often as they fall into sin after baptism ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 2.*—If any one, confounding the Sacraments, saith that Baptism is itself the Sacrament of Penance, as though these two Sacraments were not distinct, and that, therefore, Penance is not rightly called a second plank after shipwreck ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 3.*—If any one saith that those words of the Lord the Saviour, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost ; whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain they are retained," are not to be understood of the power of forgiving and of retaining of sins in the Sacrament of Penance, as the Catholic Church has always from the beginning understood them ; but wrests them contrary to the institution of this Sacrament, to the power of preaching the Gospel ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 4.*—If any one denieth that, for the entire and perfect remission of sins, there are required three acts in the penitent, which are, as it were, the matter of the Sacrament of Penance, to wit, contrition, confession, and satisfaction, which are called the three parts of penance ; or saith that there are two parts only of penance, to wit, the terrors with which the conscience is smitten upon being convinced of sin ; and the faith generated by the Gospel, or by the absolution, whereby one believes that his sins are forgiven him through Christ ; let him be anathema.



*Canon 5.*—If any one saith that contrition, which is acquired by means of the examination, confession, and detestation of sins—whereby one thinks over his years in the bitterness of his soul by pondering on the grievousness, the multitude, the filthiness of his sins, the loss of eternal blessedness, and the eternal damnation which he has incurred, having therewith the purpose of a better life—is not a true and profitable sorrow, does not prepare for grace, but makes a man a hypocrite and a greater sinner ; in fine, that this (contrition) is a forced, and not free and voluntary sorrow ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 6.*—If any one denieth, either that sacramental confession was instituted, or is necessary to salvation, of Divine right ; or saith that the manner of confessing secretly to a priest alone, which the Church has ever observed from the beginning, and doth observe, is alien from the institution and command of Christ, and is a human invention ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 7.*—If any one saith that in the Sacrament of Penance it is not necessary, of Divine right, for the remission of sins, to confess all and singular the mortal sins which after due and diligent previous meditation are remembered, even those (mortal sins) which are secret, and those which are opposed to the two last com-

mandments of the Decalogue, as also the circumstances which change the species of a sin ; but (saith) that such confession is only useful to instruct and console the penitent, and that it was of old only observed in order to impose a canonical satisfaction ; or saith that they who strive to confess all their sins wish to leave nothing to the Divine mercy to pardon ; or, finally, that it is not lawful to confess venial sins ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 8.*—If any one saith that the confession of all sins, such as it is observed in the Church, is impossible, and is a human tradition to be abolished by the godly ; or that all and each of the faithful of Christ, of either sex, are not obliged thereunto once a year, conformably to the constitution of the great Council of Lateran ; and that, for this cause, the faithful of Christ are to be persuaded not to confess during Lent ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 9.*—If any one saith that the sacramental absolution of the priest is not a judicial act, but a bare ministry of pronouncing and declaring sins to be forgiven to him who confesses ; provided only he believe himself to be absolved, or (even though) the priest absolve, not in earnest, but in joke ; or saith that the confession of the penitent is not required in order that the priest may be able to absolve him ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 10.*—If any one saith that priests who are in mortal sin have not the power of binding and of loosing ; or, that not priests alone are the ministers of absolution, but that to all and to each of the faithful of Christ is it said : “ Whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound also in Heaven, and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in Heaven ; and whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained ; by virtue of which words every one is able to absolve from sins, to wit, from public sins, by reproof only, provided he who is reproved yield thereto, and from secret sins, by a voluntary confession ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 11.*—If any one saith that bishops have not the right of reserving cases to themselves, except as regards external polity, and that therefore the reservation of cases hinders not, but that a priest may truly absolve from reserved cases ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 12.*—If any one saith that God always remits the whole punishment together with the guilt, and that the satisfaction of penitents is no other than the faith whereby they apprehend that Christ has satisfied for them ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 13.*—If any one saith that satisfaction for

sins, as to their temporal punishment, is nowise made to God through the merits of Jesus Christ by the punishments inflicted by him and patiently borne, or by those enjoined by the priest, nor even by those voluntarily undertaken as by fastings, prayers, alms-deeds, or by other works, also of piety; and that, therefore, the best penance is merely a new life; let him be anathema.

*Canon 14.*—If any one saith that the satisfactions, by which penitents redeem their sins through Jesus Christ, are not a worship of God, but traditions of men which obscure the doctrine of grace and the true worship of God, and the benefit itself of the death of Christ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 15.*—If any one saith that the keys are given to the Church only to loose, not also to bind; and that, therefore, priests act contrary to the purpose of the keys, and contrary to the institution of Christ, when they impose punishments on those who confess; and that it is a fiction that, after the eternal punishment has, by virtue of the keys, been removed, there remains, for the most part, a temporal punishment to be discharged; let him be anathema.

#### ON THE SACRAMENT OF EXTREME UNCTION.

*Canon 1.*—If any one saith that Extreme Unction

is not truly and properly a Sacrament, instituted by Christ our Lord, and promulgated by the Blessed Apostle James ; but is only a rite received from the Fathers, or a human figment ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 2.*—If any one saith that the sacred unction of the sick does not confer grace, nor remit sin, nor comfort the sick, but that it has already ceased, as though it were of old only the grace of working cures ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 3.*—If any one saith that the rite and usage of Extreme Unction, which the Holy Roman Church observes, is repugnant to the sentiment of the Blessed Apostle James, and that is therefore to be changed, and may, without sin, be contemned by Christians ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 4.*—If any one saith that the presbyters of the Church, whom Blessed James exhorts to be brought to anoint the sick, are not the priests who have been ordained by a bishop, but the elders in each community, and that for this cause a priest alone is not the proper minister of Extreme Unction ; let him be anathema.

#### ON COMMUNION UNDER BOTH SPECIES AND ON THE COMMUNION OF INFANTS.

*Canon 1.*—If any one saith that by the precept of God, or by the necessity of salvation, all and each

of the faithful of Christ ought to receive both species of the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 2.*—If any one saith that the Holy Catholic Church was not induced by just causes and reasons to communicate under the species of bread only, laymen, and also clerics when not consecrating ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 3.*—If any one denieth that Christ, whole and entire—the fountain and author of all graces—is received under the one species of bread, because that—as some falsely assert—He is not received according to the institution of Christ Himself under both species ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 4.*—If any one saith that the communion of the Eucharist is necessary for little children, before they have arrived at years of discretion ; let him be anathema.

#### ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

*Canon 1.*—If any one saith that in the Mass a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God ; or, that to be offered is nothing else but that Christ is given us to eat ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 2.*—If any one saith that by those words “ Do this, for the commemoration of Me ” (St. Luke xxii. 19), Christ did not institute the Apostles priests ; or did not ordain that they and other

priests should offer His own Body and Blood ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 3.*—If any one saith that the Sacrifice of the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and of thanksgiving ; or that it is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the Cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice ; or, that it profits him only who receives ; and that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead for sins, pains, satisfactions, and other necessities ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 4.*—If any one saith that, by the Sacrifice of the Mass, a blasphemy is cast upon the most Holy Sacrifice of Christ consummated on the Cross ; or, that it is thereby derogated from ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 5.*—If any one saith it is an imposture to celebrate Masses in honour of the Saints, and for obtaining their intercession with God, as the Church intends ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 6.*—If any one saith that the canon of the Mass contains errors, and is therefore to be abrogated ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 7.*—If any one saith that the ceremonies, vestments, and outward signs which the Catholic Church makes use of in the celebration of Masses, are incentives to impiety rather than offices of piety ; let him be anathema.



*Canon 8.*—If any one saith that Masses wherein the priest alone communicates sacramentally are unlawful, and are therefore to be abrogated ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 9.*—If any one saith that the rite of the Roman Church, according to which a part of the canon and the words of consecration are pronounced in a low tone, is to be condemned, or that the Mass ought to be celebrated in the vulgar tongue only, or that water ought not to be mixed with the wine that is offered in the chalice, as being contrary to the institution of Christ ; let him be anathema.

#### ON THE SACRAMENT OF ORDER.

*Canon 1.*—If any one saith that there is not in the New Testament a visible and external priesthood, or that there is not any power of consecrating and offering the true Body and Blood of the Lord, and of forgiving and retaining sins, but only an office and bare ministry of preaching the Gospel ; or that those who do not preach are not priests at all ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 2.*—If any one saith that, besides the priesthood, there are not in the Catholic Church other orders, both greater and minor, by which, as by certain steps, advance is made unto the priesthood ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 3.*—If any one saith that order or sacred ordination is not truly and properly a Sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord, or that it is a kind of human figment devised by men unskilled in ecclesiastical matters, or that it is only a kind of rite for choosing ministers of the Word of God and of the Sacraments ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 4.*—If any one saith that by sacred ordination the Holy Ghost is not given, and that vainly therefore do the bishops say, “Receive ye the Holy Ghost”; or that a character is not imprinted by that ordination ; or that he who has once been a priest can again become a layman ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 5.*—If any one saith that the sacred unction which the Church uses in holy ordination is not only not required, but is to be despised and is pernicious, as likewise are the other ceremonies of the order ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 6.*—If any one saith that in the Catholic Church there is not a Hierarchy by Divine ordination instituted, consisting of bishops, priests, and ministers ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 7.*—If any one saith that bishops are not superior to priests, or that they have not the power of confirming and ordaining, or that the power which they possess is common to them and to priests ; or that orders conferred by them without

the consent or vocation of the people or of the secular power are invalid ; or that those who have neither been rightly ordained nor sent by ecclesiastical and canonical power, but come from elsewhere, are lawful ministers of the Word and of the Sacraments ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 8.*—If any one saith that the bishops who are elected by the authority of the Roman Pontiff are not legitimate and true bishops, but are a human figment ; let him be anathema.

#### ON THE SACRAMENT OF MATRIMONY.

*Canon 1.*—If any one saith that matrimony is not truly and properly one of the seven Sacraments of the evangelic law (a Sacrament) instituted by Christ the Lord ; but that it has been invented by men in the Church ; and that it does not confer grace ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 2.*—If any one saith that it is lawful for Christians to have several wives at the same time, and that it is not prohibited by any Divine law ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 3.*—If any one saith that those degrees only of consanguinity and affinity which are set down in Leviticus, can hinder matrimony from being contracted, and dissolve it when contracted ; and that the Church cannot dispense in some of

those degrees, or establish that others may hinder and dissolve it ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 4.*—If any one saith that the Church could not establish impediments dissolving marriage ; that she has erred in establishing them ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 5.*—If any one saith that on account of heresy or irksome cohabitation, or the affected absence of one of the parties, the bond of matrimony may be dissolved ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 6.*—If any one saith that matrimony contracted but not consummated, is not dissolved by the solemn profession of religion by one of the contracting parties ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 7.*—If any one saith that the Church has erred in that she hath taught, and doth teach, in accordance with the evangelical and apostolical doctrine, that the bond of matrimony cannot be dissolved on account of the adultery of one of the married parties ; and that both, or even the innocent one who gave not occasion to the adultery, cannot contract another marriage during the lifetime of the other ; and, that he is guilty of adultery, who, having put away the adulteress, shall take another wife ; as also she, who, having put away the adulterer, shall take another husband ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 8.*—If any one saith that the Church errs

in that she declares that, for many causes, a separation may take place between husband and wife in regard of bed, or in regard of cohabitation for a determinate or for an indeterminate period ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 9.*—If any one saith that clerics constituted in Sacred Orders, or Regulars who have solemnly professed chastity are able to contract marriage, and that being contracted it is valid, notwithstanding the ecclesiastical law or vow, and the contrary is nothing else than to condemn marriage ; and, that all who do not feel that they have the gift of chastity, even though they have made a vow thereof, may contract marriage ; let him be anathema : seeing that God refuses not that gift to those who ask for it rightly, neither “ does He suffer us to be tempted above that which we are able.”

*Canon 10.*—If any one saith that the marriage state is to be placed above the state of virginity or of celibacy, and that it is not better to remain in virginity or in celibacy than to be united in matrimony ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 11.*—If any one saith that the prohibition of the solemnisation of marriages at certain times of the year is a tyrannical superstition of the heathen, or condemn the benediction and other ceremonies which the Church makes use of therein ; let him be anathema.

*Canon 12.*—If any one saith that matrimonial causes do not belong to ecclesiastical judges ; let him be anathema.

The Council made many decrees on the reformation of the Church. These decrees were not—as is the case in the canons already quoted—directed against heresy ; they related to matters for advancement of the Faith, and of Discipline, such as the institution of lectureships of sacred Scriptures, the residence of prelates in their dioceses, the holding of benefices, the conduct of the clergy, etc.

## CHAPTER XIII.

THE Council of Trent was the most important event of the sixteenth century. We have already referred to the religious persecutions in that century. Protestantism ultimately triumphed in Great Britain and Germany. In France, the democratic system of Calvinism had made many proselytes. The French crown had devolved upon Charles IX., a minor. His mother, Catherine de Medicis, undertook to govern, but the Guises still maintained their influence in the administration. This disgusted the princes of the blood, divided their counsels, and weakened the Government. The Calvinists seized the favorable opportunity, and broke into open rebellion. The Prince of Condé, brother to the King of Navarre, espoused their cause, and put himself at their head. Every outrage of civil war followed. The Calvinists banished the Catholic worship from every place they came to, profaned the churches, and massacred the clergy. For thirty years France was deluged in blood. The Prince of Condé was eventually slain in the bloody Battle of



Jernac, in 1569. Cologny, the Lord High Admiral of France, succeeded the Prince in the command.

A rumour was spread that the Huguenots intended to assassinate the King, and acting upon the presumption of its being true, a resolution was hastily taken to prevent its execution by a general massacre of the Huguenots in Paris, the leaders being there at the time, in order to be present at the prospective marriage of the King's sister with the son of the King of Navarre. Among those assassinated was Coligny, the ring-leader. This is known as the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. That it was unjustifiable all historians agree, but historians differ as to the facts which led to the massacre. That it was induced by the political state of parties and the fear of revolution, rather than religious motives, is now generally admitted.

The cruel massacre of the Huguenots did not, as was hoped, stifle the spirit of revolt. Civil war broke out again with fresh fury. The Prince of Bearn, who had now become King of Navarre, put himself at the head of the revolted Huguenots ; but Henry III., who had in 1574 succeeded his brother as King of France, eventually made peace with the rebels.

In 1584, Henry III. lost his only surviving brother, and Henry, King of Navarre, became heir-

apparent to the crown. He abjured the errors of Calvinism, and succeeded to the throne of France under the title of Henry IV. In 1598 he issued the Edict of Nantes, by which the Calvinists obtained the free exercise of their religion in every part of the kingdom.

The democratic principles of Calvinism also found their way to the Spanish Netherlands, and the people rebelled against Philip, King of Spain: A bloody and cruel warfare ensued between the rebels, led by the Prince of Orange and the Spanish troops, commanded at first by the Duke of Alva and subsequently by Alexander Farnese, Duke of Parma.

The King of Spain eventually resigned the sovereignty of the Netherlands to his eldest daughter and her husband Albert, the Archduke of Austria. The seven northern provinces did not choose to come into that agreement ; they claimed the independence of a separate republic, which was at length allowed them by the Peace of Westphalia.

The Treaty of Westphalia in the seventeenth century (1648), which closed the thirty years' war by which Germany had been exhausted by conflicts with France and Sweden, stipulated that the adherents of each religion should enjoy equal rights according to the constitutions of their

respective States, and invested the supreme rulers of the States immediately connected with the empire with the right of reforming the religion of the counts and vassals residing within their territories. Hence the inhabitants of the various states no longer enjoyed equal religious rights ; in some countries Catholics, in others Protestants, were denied the rights of citizenship and freedom of worship, rights which were accorded even to Jews. The inhabitants of the Palatinate within sixty years were forced, at the bidding of their respective masters, to change their religion four different times.

In this century (seventeenth) Pope Alexander VII. issued his Bull against the Jansenists. The doctrines of the Jansenists condemned may be condensed in the five following propositions :

1. Some of God's commandments are impossible to the faithful, though they desire and endeavour to keep them as far as they are able ; nor have they the grace which is requisite to render their observance possible to them.

2. In the state of corrupt nature, man never resists interior grace.

3. To merit and demerit in the state of corrupt nature, a liberty exempt from the necessity of acting is not requisite : but sufficient is the liberty which is exempt from coercion.

4. The Semipelagians admitted the necessity of a previous interior grace for every action in particular, even for the beginning of faith ; and their heresy consisted precisely in this, because they pretended that this grace was of such a nature as to leave man's will free, either to resist or to embrace it.

5. It is an error of the Semipelagians to say that Jesus Christ died and shed His blood for all men without exception.

In 1660 St. Vincent de Paul died ; in 1668 Bossuet published his "Exposition of Catholic Doctrine." The seventeenth century presents comparatively little change of much importance from the immediate point of view of religion, so far as the political situation affected the Catholic religion, except that Protestantism had assumed various aspects in different countries, and that in those countries Catholics were subjected to much persecution. In England, for instance, Catholics in the reign of Charles the Second were compelled either to forswear themselves or to forego every post of honour, of emolument, and every employment of public trust.

The eighteenth century is interesting on account of the war waged in various countries against the Jesuits. In Portugal the influence of the celebrated Minister, the Marquis of Pombal, brought about

their suppression in 1759. They were persecuted and suppressed, in France in 1764, in Spain in 1767, and in Naples in 1768.

In 1789 the French Revolution broke out, and the Constituent Assembly declared all ecclesiastical possessions national property, established a civil constitution of the clergy, subsequently forcing them (1791) to take a purely civil oath. Within two years every vestige of Christianity had disappeared. Louis XVI. had died on the scaffold. The Christian Calendar was replaced by the unmeaning Grecian decade, and the Christian worship by the orgies in honour of the Goddess of Reason. The Pope, Pius VI., who protested against all these acts, was made prisoner by the French, and Rome was proclaimed a republic.

On the death of Pius VI., Pius VII. was elected Pope at Venice; and Napoleon Bonaparte, who had been elected First Consul, and who was subsequently anointed Emperor by Pius VII., entered into a concordat with the Pope. After Napoleon's defeat at Waterloo in 1815, several concordats were concluded with the Catholic and non-Catholic Princes of Germany.

During the pontificate of Leo XII., who succeeded Pius VII., the entire Episcopacy in England (1826) published a declaration, asking for the repeal of the Penal Laws against the Cath-

olics; but it was not until 1829, during the pontificate of Pius VIII., that religious emancipation of the Irish was granted.

Pius IX. acceded to the Papal throne in 1846, and his pontificate is one of the most remarkable, both from a religious and a political point of view. In 1850 he re-established the Catholic Hierarchy in England. He entered into concordats with Russia in 1847, with Tuscany and Spain in 1851, with Guatemala in 1852, with Austria in 1855, with Würtemberg in 1857, with Baden in 1859, and with Nicaragua and San Salvador in 1861.

In 1854 (December 8th) the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, was solemnly defined during Pontifical High Mass, in the presence of the Sacred College and assembled bishops, and promulgated by the Bull, *Ineffabilis Deus*.

But the most important events of his reign were the Vatican Council and the incorporation of Rome in the kingdom of Italy.

On December 6th, 1864, Pope Pius IX., presiding over a session of the Congregation of Rites, first made known to the Cardinals present that for a long time the thought of convoking an Ecumenical Council as an extraordinary remedy to the needs of the Christian world had occupied his mind; and he bade the Cardinals to weigh the matter each



one by himself, and to communicate to him in writing, and separately, what, before God, they judged to be right. The replies treated of:

1. The present state of the world in regard to subjects strictly in relation to the eternal end of our existence.
  2. The question whether the state of the world requires the supreme remedy of an Ecumenical Council.
  3. The difficulties of holding an Ecumenical Council, and how to overcome them.
  4. The subjects which ought to be treated by such a Council.
1. As regards the state of the world, the answers affirm that the special character of the age is the tendency of a dominant party to destroy all the ancient Christian institutions, the life of which consists in a supernatural principle, and to erect upon their ruins a new order founded on natural reason alone; the withdrawal of civil society and of science from the authority of revelation is the seed of Naturalism, Rationalism, Pantheism, Socialism, and Communism. That from these speculative errors flows in practice the modern revolutionary Liberalism, which consists in the assertion of the supremacy of the State over the spiritual jurisdiction



of the Church, over education, marriage, consecrated property, and the temporal power of the head of the Church; that Liberalism results in the indifferentism which equalises all religions, and gives equal rights to truth and error.

2. For these reasons almost all the Cardinals were of opinion that the remedy of an Ecumenical Council was necessary.
3. They admitted that there were obstacles in the way of holding a Council, such as the attitude of civil governments which are either hostile or indifferent, the absence of bishops from their dioceses, etc.; but, nevertheless, they were of opinion that the need that a Council should be held was greater than the dangers of holding it.
4. The condemnation of modern errors, the exposition of Catholic doctrine, the raising of the state of the clergy and of the Religious Orders, the licence of the press, secret societies, civil marriage, mixed marriages, ecclesiastical possessions, the observance of feasts, abstinence, fasting. Two only spoke of the infallibility of the Pontiff.

The Pope subsequently (March, 1865) appointed a Commission of Cardinals to meet and consider the opinions expressed, and confer together as to

whether an Ecumenical Council should be convoked or not. The Commission having reported in favour of the convocation of the Council, the Pope then, by circular letter to a number of bishops of all nations, enjoined them to send in writing an enumeration of the subjects which they thought the Council ought to treat. The bishops, in reply, note that there exists no new or special heresy in matters of faith ; but rather a universal perversion and confusion of first truths and principles which assail the foundations of truth and the preambles of all belief. The bishops suggested that the Council should declare that the existence of God may be certainly known by the light of nature, and define the natural and supernatural condition of man, redemption, grace, and the Church. They specially desired the treatment of the nature and personality of God distinct from the world, creation, and providence ; the possibility and the fact of a Divine revelation. The materialistic philosophies current in Germany and France show the wisdom of these suggestions. They further propose for treatment the Divine institution of the Church ; the primacy and jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff ; its independence of civil powers and its relation to them ; its authority over education, and the present necessity of the temporal power of the Holy See. Out of

thirty-six bishops consulted, a few only suggested the infallibility of the head of the Church. In fact, the governing thought in the answers of the Cardinals and bishops for holding an Ecumenical Council, converged upon the evils of the modern world, its theological, philosophical, religious, social, domestic, and moral confusions.

The Council was opened on the 8th of December, 1869.

Many important decisions in regard to the Faith were given ; but the subject which has elicited the greatest interest was the definition of the infallibility of the Pope ; but the question whether the infallibility of the head of the Church was a true doctrine or not was never discussed in the Council, nor even proposed to it.

In 1854, two hundred and six Cardinals and bishops assembled for the definition of the Immaculate Conception, and assisted at the promulgation of a doctrine of faith by the sole authority of their head. The doctrine of infallibility had been accepted as a matter of course in 1854. The only question was whether it was expedient, prudent, seasonable, and timely, regard being had to the condition of the world, of the nations of Europe, of the Christians in separation from the Church, to put this truth in the form of a definition. A minority of the bishops were op-

posed, not to the doctrine, but to the defining it at this time. They urged that the infallibility of the Church has never been defined, and asked, Why define it now? or, at least, Why define the infallibility of its head?

The discussions on this question occupied eleven sessions: on July 13th, 1870, the proposal to define the doctrine of "Infallibility" was passed by a great majority; the whole *Schema* was then reprinted and distributed to the Council, and the final vote was taken. Of the six hundred and one Fathers present, four hundred and fifty-one voted *placet*; the *non-placets* were eighty-eight; the *placets juxta modum*, that is, placets with modifications, were sixty-two. These amendments, to the number of one hundred and sixty-three, were sent, as usual, to the Commission. They were examined and reported on the 16th of July. Many were adopted, together with two amendments proposed by the Commission. The whole was then reprinted and distributed, put once more to the vote and passed. In this session five hundred and thirty-five voted; of these five hundred and thirty-three voted *placet*; two only voted *non-placet*.

The Pontiff then confirmed the decree in the usual words. In a brief address to the Council he prayed that the few who had been of another mind in a time of agitation might in a season

of calm be reunited to the great majority of their brethren, and contend with them for the truth. The *Te Deum* was then sung, and the Pontifical Benediction closed the fourth public Session of the Council of the Vatican, and a conflict which for centuries had troubled the peace of the Church.

The day of the promulgation of the decree of the Infallibility of the Pope (July 18th, 1870) coincided with the day on which France declared war against Prussia. The States of the Church had already in 1860 been reduced to the "Patrimony" of St. Peter. The French troops were recalled from Rome during the Franco-German War. This war ended in the capture and dethronement of the Emperor Napoleon III., the destruction of the French army, and the temporary paralysis of France; and Victor Emanuel, King of Italy, who up to this moment had been restrained by the power of France, now proceeded to carry out the long cherished design of seizing Rome.

After a short and gallant struggle the small Pontifical army was defeated on September 20th, 1870, and Rome taken forcible possession of by the troops of the kingdom of Italy.

It is doubtful whether the Romans, under the crushing burdens of taxation, are happier under the present *régime*. The robbery of Rome from

the Pope, and delight it gave to a thoughtless, material world, are signs of the times. It might have been hoped that Catholics, Protestants, and infidels would have resented the action of the Italian Government.

In the first place, whatever claims the Italians might have to incorporate in the kingdom of Italy other portions of the Roman States, Rome should have been held sacred. Moreover, Papal Rome was created by the collective piety, devotion, and wealth of the whole Christian world of all ages, and could in no sense be held to be the property of the people who were born in or inhabited the city at any particular time. But the material loss is of little importance as compared with the transformation which clerical and artistic Rome has undergone. That the world should have rejoiced was indeed senseless.

Do not Paris, London, Vienna, and Madrid, as well as other capital cities, sufficiently resemble one another? They have each their opera houses and theatres, with their scantily clothed ballet-girls; their stock exchanges, with their financial circles; their *beau monde*, their dignitaries of State, their representative Chambers, and their military parades. Where was the necessity of making Rome one more centre of the same type? The greediness of the world is incomprehensible; but

that the world should have conspired to deprive itself of the solitary city where it might seek repose, and where the devotee, the scholar, and the artist might live in a congenial atmosphere, is truly marvellous. It might have been hoped that the world would have remembered that Rome, by preaching the Christian philosophy of subordinating material advantages and force to moral duty, has elevated the human mind, and has been the greatest civilising influence which the world has known.









WALPOLE, F.G.

BQX

A Short history of the

82

.W3

Catholic Church.

DATE	ISSUED TO
Oct. 5	Virginia Mayan
Mar 14	18 McClellan and Woodman.
Oct 20	Kugh [unclear]
18 Oct 17	DEC 19 1958

WALPOLE

BQX

82

.W3 .

